The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXIX, No. 2 AUGUST, 1953

CONTENTS

The God Called Progress *Robert Paul Mohan, S.S.* 73

Lay Participation in the High School of Religion *Jerome J. Hastrich* 83

Mary and Russia's Mother-Soil *Aidan Carr, O.F.M.Conv.* 88

Jottings in Italy *Gabriel A. Zema, S.J.* 95

The Truth About the Holy Shroud. Part II *Edward A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R.* 100

Quodlibetal Questions. Part IV *John K. Ryan* 115

The Teaching of the *Testem Benevolentiae* *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 124

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Garb for the Minister of Penance 134

Practice for First Communion 135

The Office Worker and the Eucharistic Fast 135

The Right to Baptize a Convert 136

Benediction on Feast of Sacred Heart 137

Reading the Last Gospel 137

Purifying the Chalice 138

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1953, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Blessed Sacrament Chapel 138

Altar Bell 138

Benediction with the Ciborium 139

Wearing the Biretta 139

Veni Creator at Confirmation Service 139

Inside Tabernacle Veil 140

Apologies 140

BOOK REVIEWS

What America Means to Me, and Other Prayers and Poems, *by Francis Cardinal Spellman* 141

The Cana Movement in the United States, *by Dr. A. H. Clemens* 141

Recent Thought in Focus, *by Donald Nicholl* 142

Subscribe today to
The Catholic Educational Review

A "Must" for Every Catholic School and Educator

- Published under the direction of the Department of Education, The Catholic University of America.
- Monthly from September through June.
- Indexed in The Catholic Periodical Index, The Education Index, and The Guide to Catholic Literature.
- Articles, Abstracts, Notes, News, Book Reviews, Up-to-the-Minute and Practical

Indispensable for every Catholic school and educator

- Elementary, High School, College levels.

Subscription Price: U. S., Canada & Foreign $4.00

Single Number 40c

IDEAL AS A GIFT

Address:

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

THE GOD CALLED PROGRESS

In their November message, the Catholic hierarchy of the United States referred to "the pseudo-religion of progress," which, although conceived in terms of a "materialistic or secularistic evolution" has exercised, and continues to exercise a great attraction—even to those who are theoretically Christian.[1]

This idea of evolving linear progress is psychologically satisfying as well as philosophically ancient, and even the frightful *hubris* of our age is impotent to destroy the popular conviction that we are moving inevitably toward the "good life."[2] But if there is anything in a society that is as disturbing as its unreasonable prejudices, it is its unwarranted assumptions. The doctrine of inevitable progress is an assumption, but one that endures well because it is a soporific by which we are anesthetized to the pain that often comes with objective appraisal.

A man may utter an opinion with hyperthyroid vigor, or he may ease it across conversationally with an understandable diffidence. In both cases he may be in egregious error, but even in the first case in which noisy assertiveness drowns out humble reflection, there is still the honesty of open affirmation.

One can often refute what a man says; but one is frequently unable to disprove what a man assumes. For the assumption dwells in unassailable contentment, a prodigal child of the intellectual life which basks in as much protective love as the more legitimate progeny of reason.

The doctrine of inevitable progress, the pagan's providence, is one of the most indestructible of twentieth-century assumptions. Victorian optimism has indeed vanished to a great degree, but a

[1] Text of the Bishops' message issued at the annual meeting of the Catholic hierarchy in Washington, D. C., November, 1952.

[2] As Garrigou-Lagrange has pointed out, any progressivist philosophy of change, be it conceived in the idealistic terms of a Hegel or in the materialistic terms of a Haeckel, is basically Heraclitean in its conception. St. Thomas himself was familiar with this type of thinking, not only because of his knowledge of Heraclitus derived from Aristotle, but also because of his acquaintance (via Augustine and Dionysius) with Stoic evolutionism, and the emanationism of Plotinus and the Neo-Platonists (Cf. *God, His Existence and His Nature* [St. Louis: Herder, 1935], II, 456).

belief in progress remains. It is the means by which the modern is oblivious of all that would blur the image of that blessed tomorrow that looms tantalizingly behind the horizon of a rather unholy today. And if one dissents mildly that the unpleasantness of today's world prevents confidence in the promised joy of tomorrow, there is always the emollient reminder that yesterday was worse than both.

We hear thundering clichés about the primitiveness of dark ages, the enlightenment of today, and the unlimited possibilities of tomorrow. Unhappily, the periods of darkness are often ill-defined, although we are led to believe that they were roughly synonymous with a period in which man was hopelessly intimidated by religious obscurantism, and totally uninterested in inside plumbing. The enlightenment of today is based on the illusion that a knowledge of facts constitutes wisdom; on the conviction that nobody in history has been unhappy as comfortably as we are; and on the confidence that no one has ever had the involutional omniscience of the structure of our universe, even if he might have had more to say about its ultimate significance. Alfred Noyes has a very apt description of the type of enlightenment peculiar to our time.

> It is a plain fact that in our rapidly growing world, the extension of various kinds of specialized knowledge, all valuable in their own way, has given us so many twigs to look at, that we are not only blind to the woods, but have almost ceased to believe in trees.[3]

The untold possibilities of which the secular futurist speaks are like the plaintive notes of some pied piper who can hardly be heard amid the charivari of the world's contentions. It is, of course, reasonable enough to speak of the possibility of progress where there are free men, but it is unreasonable to speak of that progress as inevitable.

Like Wells, the futurist may consider progress as an inevitable trend to democratization; he may see a power of redemptive history like Kant or Mill; or like Jean Bodin, reputedly the first French writer to study history from a strictly philosophical point

[3] Alfred Noyes, *The Unknown God* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940), p. 10.

of view, he may look upon the entire historical process as an inflexible trend to betterment.[4]

But in general, the futurist, substituting wistful hope for perceptive vision, accepts a quasi-Couéism; and although he may not be convinced that day by day in every way he is getting better and better, he is convinced that the agony of our hour is not the anguish of a civilization about to die, but the puerperal spasms of an age about to be born.

It is more or less tacitly assumed by the futurist that the only alternative to his position is pessimism, whether found in pagan cynicism or anguish-ridden Christianity. But it is not true that a philosophy of pessimism is the only alternative to a philosophy of inevitable progress. Advancement in cultural and spiritual ideals, for instance, is perfectly understandable where there is freedom, but such progress must be bought at a price that man is willing to pay. And even when a philosophy of life based on ontological values identifies a direction as a progressive direction, the man who follows it is quite capable of reversing his field.

It is, of course, quite convenient to look upon progress as something that is the automatic result of a blind *nisus* within society or the universe itself, for it puts man in the relatively comfortable position of a spectator who can look with Olympian disdain at the evolution of a better world to which his creative energies are not obliged to minister. But one might paraphrase the **πάθει μάθος** formula of Aeschylus, and claim that just as learning comes only through suffering, so does the progress of which learning is but a part.

It is because of what Toynbee would call a free response of man to a stimulus and challenge of his world that one might question the contention of Karl Löwith that historical understanding of any kind must be reduced to two ancient concepts of antiquity: cyclical motion and eschatological direction.[5] For the linear con-

[4] For a competent historical survey of this problem, see Fr. Joseph De La Vega's *Social Progress and Happiness in the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949), ch. 1.

[5] Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), p. 1. Toynbee, incidentally, calls linear progress an "illusion" which is simply the result of the mind's tendency to over-simplification (Cf. *A Study of History* [London: Oxford University Press, 1933], I, 168).

ception of progress as conceived by secular futurists differs completely from Greek cyclicism, and bears only a superficial resemblance to Christian eschatology. H. Stuart Hughes, too, in a fine study of Spengler, makes the statement that the Christian Western idea " . . . can be called linear, as opposed to the cyclic theory of the ancients."[6]

The Christian, it is true, may ride along through the years sharing immediate aims and goals of civic and social betterment of the secularist, but both in his evaluation of the temporal historical process and in the transcendent goal of that process itself, he presents a startling contrast to the progressivist. Collingwood brings out this difference quite well in his concept of "apocalyptic history," in which a period of light inaugurated by the Incarnation gives a new significance to the entire historical process. In describing such a view of history he says:

> . . . It will attach a central importance . . . to the historical life of Christ. . . . It will make its narrative crystallize itself round that event, and treat earlier events as leading up to it or preparing for it, and subsequent events as developing its consequences.[7]

These words emphasize the tremendous difference between an eschatological and a secularistic view of progress.

Obviously, there is a Catholic concept of progress. St. Augustine's *City of God*, for instance, gives us one of the first organized philosophical syntheses of an historical process by which a free people moves toward a transcendent goal; and certainly this is a kind of progress.

It remains then to isolate for examination that species of progress that has developed into a secular *mystique*.

One of the classic expressions of pagan futurism is to be found in J. B. Bury:

> The idea of human progress . . . is based on an interpretation of history which regards men as slowly advancing—pedetentim progredientes—in a definite and desirable direction, and infers that this

---

[6] H. Stuart Hughes, *Oswald Spengler* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 29.

[7] R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 50.

progress will continue indefinitely. . . . The process must be the necessary outcome of the psychical nature of man; it must not be at the mercy of any external will . . . [or] the idea of Progress would lapse into the idea of Providence."[8]

It is interesting to seek the sources of this kind of futuristic thinking, particularly since the Greeks, to whom we are accustomed to attribute almost every mental aberration and intellectual triumph, give little evidence of thinking along these lines at all. Ancient Greece gives us little insight into Providence or secular futurism,[9] primarily, because the genius of the Greeks was philosophic rather than religious,[10] and secondarily, because even the philosophic evaluations of finality had relevance only within the generally accepted cyclicism which the Greek mind ordinarily took for granted as readily as it accepted the eternity of the universe. As Christopher Dawson has phrased it: "From the age of Pythagoras and Heraclitus down to the last days of the School of Athens under the Christian emperors, the doctrine of the Great Year, and the recurrent cycle of cosmic change dominated the Greek mind."[11]

Dawson goes on to say that it is probably true that the evolutionary theory of progress is anticipated in Lucretius and Epicurus, but not even in these men does the theory of progress assume its traditional eighteenth-century form. And the ancient thought of the Chinese and the Persians seems to indicate a similar reluctance to analyze the historical process in terms of a rectilinear development from the lower to the higher.

The eighteenth-century form of the idea of progress was certainly not a preoccupation with the medieval world, for the medieval man lived in a world that had achieved, not as J. N. Figgis so blandly states, a realization of the kingdom of God on earth, but a definite orientation in a theocentric world.[12]

[8] J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (London: MacMillan, 1928), p. 5.

[9] Plato, however, in *Timaeus*, 30, and in *Philebus*, 30, comes close to the Christian notion of Providence.

[10] Cf. Etienne Gilson's *God and Philosophy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943), ch. 1.

[11] Christopher Dawson, *Progress and Religion* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1933), p. 146. This is a classic text on the problem of progress.

[12] John N. Figgis, *The Political Aspects of St. Augustine's "City of God,"* (London: Longmans, Green, 1921), p. 95.

Roger Shinn, in a rather bizarre interpretation of medieval thought, sees in St. Thomas' interpretation of history a dangerously static immobility occasioned by what Toynbee calls the "idolization of an ephemeral institution" and hazards the opinion that such an interpretation "would seem to be far more dangerous for today than it was for his own day."[13]

But satisfaction with a mundane order is precisely what medieval man would not have, for he considered himself a *viator*, a wayfarer who was to find his true home in heaven alone, and his true joy in the Beatific Vision. The progress of the medieval world is a progress "orientated towards a definite term."[14]

It was by no means impossible for the medievalist to look upon his Church as the divinely established institution that it was, and yet look to eternity alone for the realization of his hopes and dreams; for his Church itself told him in the classic idiom of Paul (*Heb.* 13:14) that we have here no lasting city.

It is, of course, convenient and customary for many contemporary critics to look with considerable distaste at the Church as a medieval colossus of monolithic solidarity exemplifying a stultifying ecclesiasticism, but to assert that the medieval Catholic saw in the society of his time a theocracy that brought heaven to earth is to give more eloquent testimony to quaint sectarian prejudice than to historical fact.

The Catholic historian is not alone in seeing medieval man as one interested in a progress that was to be realized in its fullness

[13] Roger Shinn, *Christianity and the Problem of History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 73. This is a work of considerable merit, but having read Mr. Toynbee quite thoroughly and talked with him on the problems of civilizations, I am inclined to doubt that the medieval Church was the "ephemeral institution" that he had in mind when he wrote of the "nemesis of creativity."

There has been of late a marked interest in Protestant circles in the theological implications of history, possibly occasioned by as great a dislike of the guidance furnished by personal vagary as that furnished by dogma. Cf. Shirley Jackson Case's *The Christian Philosophy of History*, Reinhold Niebuhr's *Faith and History*, Herbert Butterfield's *Christianity and History*, and Karl Löwith's *Meaning in History*.

[14] Etienne Gilson, *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), p. 389. Chap. XIX, "The Middle Ages and History," treats the subject quite well.

only in eternity.[15] The progress with which the medieval citizen was concerned was primarily spiritual, and although men were by no means universally holy, we can look in vain for the accoutrements of the modern idea of progress as the eighteenth century came to define it.

In the post-medieval world the voices of Machiavelli, Vico, and Campanella spoke the language of cyclicism, and were singularly unimpressed by the notion of progress; but with Condorcet futurism was to find one of its most eloquent spokesmen.[16] To Condorcet, nature put no barrier in the way of the perfection of human faculties. Reality was continuous, finality was replaced by sheer mechanism; and progress was universal and inevitable. Condorcet alone, however, can hardly be regarded as the sole reason for the popularity of futurism—even in eighteenth-century France. The theme was also to be found in the famous *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire des sciences, des arts, et des métiers*, which had been issued between the years 1751-80, and which admirably reflected the political, social, and philosophical temper of the time.[17]

[15] Cf., for example, Henry Osborn Taylor's *The Medieval Mind* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), I, 557. The ideal was often in sharp contrast to what Taylor calls the "spotted actuality," but the general orientation of medieval culture seems to be beyond dispute. For a detailed study of the academic progress of the period, cf. *Rashdall's Medieval Universities*, Powicke and Emden (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), 3 vols; and also A. C. Crombie's *Augustine to Galileo, A History of Science, A.D. 400-1650* (London: Falcon Educational Press, 1952), chaps. 3 and 4.

[16] The Marquis de Condorcet actually wrote his *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain* in 1794 while hiding in the home of a Girondist sympathizer from the "progressive" vengeance of his brave new world. His protector, Madame Vernet, appears to have been a remarkably brave woman. When Condorcet expressed a desire to leave the asylum she provided because he was breaking the law, she is said to have answered with almost theatrical bravado: "Vous êtes hors la loi, mais vous n'êtes pas hors l'humanité, et vous resterez!" He finally did leave his asylum on the rue Sevandoni, and after undergoing indescribable hardships as a fugitive, was finally arrested. He thwarted his captors tragically by taking poison which he had concealed in a ring.

[17] The ideological role of the *Encyclopédie* in the French Revolution has perhaps been exaggerated. It was published at Paris in twenty-eight volumes (1751-72); a five-volume supplement was issued (1776-77); and an analytical index was published in 1780. Diderot and d'Alembert did most of the editing of the work of 160 contributors. The rationalism of the *Encyclopédie* was not

The emergence of the philosophy of progress seems to begin with the emergence of the "practical" man, a man who fancied himself freed from the tedious lucubrations of the philosopher and theologian, and destined to come to grips with life on its most tangible levels.

The practical man was more interested in fact than in wisdom; he was mesmerized by the new science of a Kepler and a Newton which was opening up new vistas of thought. As a matter of fact, the practical man himself was opening up new vistas of thought, but he thought he was opening up new worlds. He lived in a world of new values, and it did not always matter to him that those values were often different without being better. But such inhibiting conclusions would be the result of reflection, and reflection was more redolent of a static past than of a dynamic future, and the practical man felt much more at home with Heraclitus than with Parmenides.[18]

We see the practical man almost a century earlier in the young Hobbes, who shed his Oxford scholasticism as so much *decidua*, to embrace a world in which the former centrifugal force of religion, as Dr. Rudolf Allers has phrased it, yielded to the varied centripetal interests of the specialized sciences. Thinking in terms of science, the futurist began to see reality as a cosmic game of problems and solutions. And when there appeared those who would ask how the answer to a specialized problem could compensate for the absence of a philosophy of life, the practical man was not so much irritated by the question as he was disconcerted that such irrelevant questions were still being asked.

In short, the practical man was a hod-carrier who carried the bricks and mortar of which the city of man was built. He looked at that city and saw that it was good, for it was built not only with devoted love but with almost servile adulation. It was a city of peace, for its citizens did not do battle with those who would retain the hope of a city of God. It rather absorbed them

---

peculiarly French, as is often assumed. British influence, particularly that of Bacon and Locke, was quite marked. The Abbé de St. Pierre is also associated with the progressivistic thought of this general period.

[18] Marx captured the activist spirit when in his *Theses on Feuerbach* (1845) he wrote: "Philosophers have only interpreted the world, but the real task is to alter it."

with the patronizing kindness of a family rather amused at but rarely critical of the vagaries of an aged and eccentric relative. It was a city of inventiveness, for the city of man was a city of things, not thoughts; it attested to the triumph of results over aspirations, and earthly satisfactions over spiritual yearnings.

In the eighteenth century, it was still true, as Augustine had said, that two loves had built two cities, but in the vast secularization of the age, the city of man seemed much more impressive. Not only did science and reason reign supreme in their own temples, but a strumpet goddess called Reason sat enthroned in Notre Dame, in the very citadel of the Enemy.

But the votaries of reason were quite fickle. The Reason that the Encyclopedists claimed was to drive out ignorance and superstition yielded to the futurist's adulation of positive science, and metaphysics was as little regarded as Revelation before a century had passed. The futurists listened with rapture as Auguste Comte presided at the obsequies of Reason, as their fathers had listened in rapture to the obsequies of Faith. The third stage in the drama of man had arrived, and positive science was to reign supreme. And this is the world which the progressivist has made.

His illusions are not destroyed, but he thinks it somewhat indecent that the corpses of Reason and Faith do not stay dead. Positive science is still his beloved, but he admits that he does not understand her. He seeks from her guidance, and she gives him facts; he begs for wisdom and she grants him knowledge. She has shown that she can hurt as much as she can heal, and she does both with a terrible brilliance, but the futurist is convinced in his heart of hearts that she will be better tomorrow.

Because the belief in rectilinear progress is a *mystique*, for which the heart alone has reasons, it has indeed filled a void in the life of contemporary man by persuading him that the sting of today's frustrations will be forgotten in tomorrow's accomplishments. How strange it is that this conception of those who would deify Reason elicits a fervor that defies reason in its pseudo-religious dedication! For secular futurism is not a philosophy; it is a faith—a faith of those who cling tenaciously to a comforting illusion, because they have nothing else to give mean-

ing to their lives. As Ibsen has pointed out, if a man cannot have substance of reality, he must have the shadows of illusion.

Christian eschatology also involves a progress of man and society, but it is a progress of free agents toward their proper perfection. Because its final term is not earth but heaven, it does not follow that the Christian is not interested in the improvement of this world. For the world that Our Saviour condemned was not a place, but a spirit, and the Christian, as Chesterton has said, must somehow love the world without being worldly. The primary mandate of our Faith, charity, far from fostering an abhorrence of all that is in the world, is a summons to create the good life on earth that will be conducive to the blissful life of eternity.

With the finite goals of the Christian, the futurist of more noble stature is usually in agreement, but to him, in the language of Cervantes, the road is better than the inn. And if the futurist can be induced to tarry anywhere, he hopes to do so in an antiseptically clean Babylon, not in a heavenly Jerusalem.

In fine, the god called progress fashioned in the eighteenth-century world still reigns in many hearts. In varying accents from the Marquis de Condorcet to Roy Wood Sellars, we have heard litanies extolling its virtues with an indiscriminate zeal. Well have the shepherds of the Church in America called it a pseudo-religion, for it stands at this troubled hour of the world's history a strange faith that has evolved from faithlessness. But it is a faith that will prove as traitorous in the twentieth century as it did in the eighteenth, for it is a faith that is in perpetual retreat into endless tomorrows.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

LAY PARTICIPATION IN THE HIGH SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Where priests are personally participating in phases of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine instruction program, it is usually on the high school level.[1] However, priests alone will never be able adequately either to reach or to teach the 1,500,000 Catholic students attending public high schools. Other demands on their time, the numbers to be taught in urban areas and the distances to be covered in rural areas make it imperative that the laity be trained to participate in various phases of the CCD high school program.

Further, notwithstanding the fact that all priests have the necessary theological knowledge, not every priest is sufficiently well grounded in pedagogy or personally aware of the special needs of the teen-agers to organize a program or impart his own knowledge in a way that will meet their needs. Even the best of CCD priest-teachers need lay assistance in carrying out a full-scale high school program.

In every parish there are men and women who live and work closely with young people. With direction and training, these men and women may assist in the administration and teaching of high school classes.

WHO QUALIFIES

Various classes of lay people have the special qualifications needed for the teaching of religion. Undoubtedly the best qualified are public high school teachers who have been trained in Catholic colleges. Having taken courses in educational psychology, vocational guidance, apologetics and ethics, and having taught young people, these teachers make ideal instructors for the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. These men and women have the theoretical and practical background for the work. If they are good teachers, they are already well thought of by public

[1] The substance of this article will appear as a chapter in the manual *How to Plan and Conduct the Parish CCD High School of Religion*, to be published this fall by The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (National Center: 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C.).

school youth. Young people are hero worshippers. Who can teach religion with greater effect and inspiration than one who has a reputation as a leader among youth?

Parents have at least a practical knowledge of young people and their interests. Fathers and mothers who have succeeded in disciplining their own sons and daughters will have a good idea of how to handle the problem in the classroom. With a little interest in religion and a willingness to learn, a parent makes a first-class teacher.

In areas where they are available, major seminarians and college students are enlisted. They may not have a disciplinary hold on the class and a sufficiently mature knowledge of religion, but this can be offset by careful supervision and the training classes recommended for teachers in the high school of religion.

Former public school teachers, graduates of Catholic colleges and high schools or of CCD high school classes, adult discussion club leaders and members, teaching Sisters and Brothers make good CCD teachers. In hundreds of parishes, Catholic members of the various professions, farmers, bookkeepers, service station attendants, store and office workers, factory foremen and workers are successfully teaching small groups of students. In every case a brief preparatory course on a diocesan or parish basis has remarkably fitted them as lay participants.

PROPER ATMOSPHERE

The lighted school or hall, with the Registrar near the entrance directing pupils to their proper classrooms, makes for orderly approach to the high school of religion. This is a great improvement over the noisy hall or auditorium in which one priest is desperately trying to quiet a hundred or more freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors so as to be able to give them a few minutes of instruction. It is impossible to create a high school of religion atmosphere without several teachers under a principal or supervisor. The laity are needed in order to develop a "school of religion" attitude in pupils and parents.

The task of teaching is not too difficult, especially if graded classes are taught on a discussion club basis. The idea of placing a catechism in the hands of a prospective, bewildered teacher and expecting a successful religion class to result is past. Teacher

courses and pupil texts, if not selected by the diocesan CCD office, should be carefully chosen.

Modern texts are geared to the teen-age mind. Little more than the ability to read and relate the context in a lively manner is needed. Texts remove the danger of theological and moral error. Special teachers' copies, or answer books, are available for some series, to obviate the possibility of error. The priest-director must be available for consultation with the teacher, who promises to bring the answer back to class the next week, if a problem comes up for which there is no answer in the book.

THE PRIEST

Although all Confraternity work demands the constant guidance and inspiration of the clergy, there is no phase of the work which needs the priest for its success as much as does the high school of religion. He must be available for spiritual guidance before and after classes. He must visit every classroom from time to time to quiz and to check the progress of the course.

Regular faculty meetings are imperative. While the principal or supervisor can relieve the priest of all the mechanics of operating the school, the priest should be present at every meeting to get to know his teachers, to learn their weak and strong points in dogma, moral and sacramental theology, and church history. He will find that a regular talk, incorporating a fuller explanation of some doctrine not too well understood, will develop a good Catholic sense in the teachers, who, if they are not well acquainted with certain doctrines, will tend to pass them by hurriedly or to skip them entirely. A diocesan testing program will help the priest in insisting upon coverage of the text. The lay teacher must be encouraged to discuss his problems with the priest before or after faculty meetings or at any time during the week.

FISHERS (VISITORS)

Home visitors have a task to perform before the opening of the school term as well as throughout the year. If the pastor is introducing the high school of religion idea for the first time, one of the best means of informing parents and pupils of the plan is a personal visit. The home visitors explain the project and solicit a pledge of co-operation from parents and pupils. Parents are

told what is expected of them: keeping one evening each week free for their son's or daughter's school attendance, attending periodic meetings with teachers, signing absentee records and report cards at the end of each term, etc. In subsequent years, the fishers will explain the program to newcomers to the parish.

During the weekly sessions of the CCD high school of religion the fisher obtains a list of absentees from the teachers. A post-card, telephone call, or personal visit to the parents of these students follows. The fisher is the liaison between parents and teachers. Upon his shoulders rests the responsibility of clarifying any misunderstanding which may exist and thus keeping alive the spirit of co-operation.

HELPERS

The high school of religion requires much preparation. If the parish school is used, the helpers win the good will of the Sisters by assuring them that they alone will open and lock doors and check the condition of the rooms before and after classes. The complaint so often made by parochial school teachers that the classrooms are unfit for habitation the morning after the CCD high school of religion meets is thus eliminated. If a hall is used, there are chairs to be arranged; lights and windows to be checked; chalk, erasers, and blackboards to be provided. Helpers will distribute and collect class materials, prepare posters, and make illustrative charts and graphs to help the teacher, call the roll, etc. If classes are held in the evening, a whole fleet of cars may be needed to bring students from rural districts, and there are usually physically handicapped pupils to be called for. Helpers are the "handy-men" of the program.

The Principal or Supervisor of the CCD school may also be classified as a helper. The position is a most important one. A person with some administrative ability and a sympathetic understanding of youth should be chosen. It is his task to give unity to the school, to preside at faculty meetings, and to act as a court of appeal in teacher-pupil difficulties.

The Registrar likewise is a helper. He or she is charged with the task of keeping accurate records. New pupils report to him to fill out a CCD regiatration card. Sufficient information must be obtained by the Registrar for the guidance and classification

of the pupils. Spiritual problems which come to light in this questioning are to be considered strictly confidential, except for revelation to the priest. The absentee record passes through the hands of the Registrar for recording and transmission to the home visitors.

If a social program is added to the high school of religion, its position is always that of an extracurricular activity. It is to be a means of attracting pupils to the school of religion and of acquainting Catholic boys and girls with one another. While much of the work connected with such a program will be done by the teen-agers themselves, an adult social adviser is essential to help plan and carry out the program. It will be his or her job to obtain recreational literature from the Government, Catholic Youth organizations, or the public library; to round up adult sponsors to be present as assistants at each social event.

Vocational guidance is stressed in public education and should be a part of the CCD high school of religion as well. Certainly one helper can be found, especially in large city parishes, who will gather vocational literature and guide youngsters, according to their abilities and aptitudes, into positions where they can influence others to think with Christ. Trips through local public institutions, factories, seminaries and colleges will help a student determine his life's work.

JEROME J. HASTRICH

Madison, Wis.

MARY AND RUSSIA'S MOTHER-SOIL

His Eminence Gregory Peter XV Cardinal Agagianian, Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenians, recently voiced a firm conviction that Russia will return to the Church. This distinguished prelate's statement was reported in *L'Osservatore Romano.*

The Cardinal based his prediction on the truly Christian character of the Russian people; on the express desire of Our Lady of Fatima for their conversion; on the fact that the entire Church, in the prayers after Mass, implores God's grace and Mary's intercession for Russia. Cardinal Agagianian was at one time a parish priest in what is now Soviet Armenia, and he is still the spiritual leader of thousands of Armenian Catholics isolated behind the Iron Curtain.

In Russian history and literature as well as in the most orthodox currents of Orthodox theology, the vital role of the Virgin in mankind's spiritual destiny has consistently been accorded an exalted place. Vladimir, the warrior-Christian, whose glory is to have established Christianity as the official state religion of Russia, constructed a massive church in honor of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary on the banks of the Dnieper nearly a thousand years ago. The giants of Russian literature: Tolstoy, Chekov, Dostoyevsky, frequently write in reverent tones of the Virgin and the love of the Russian people for her. Orthodox liturgy is rich with her praises, and in "the old days" every home had a cherished corner for her icon.

Even amid the fierce polemics and nearly unabated persecution of the Latin Catholics, from the era of the Orthodox Metropolitan Nicephorus I (1103-1121) right down to the apocalyptic Revolution of 1917, the mass of the Russian nation loved Mary. Glorious shrines were erected to "Bogoroditza"—She who gave birth to God—at Kiev, Novgorod, Kazath and countless other hallowed spots, dear to the Russian Christians.

"We can be certain," Cardinal Agagianian concluded, "that there are still in Russia millions thirsting for God, attached to the Christian traditions of their ancestors and particularly to the filial veneration of the great Mother of God."

It has remained for satanic Communism to lash out in blind fury at the cult of Mary. How commonplace and yet how vastly significant was this news item reported several weeks ago in our daily papers: one Stefania Rospond, an obscure young Polish woman, was sentenced by the Communist masters of Poland to six years in jail. The sole offense charged against her—"She is a leading member of the Catholic Rosary Association of Girls." To love Our Lady and to strive to win others to her is grossly criminal to the darkened eyes of Yagoda's "militant godless."

The former Communist organizer, Arthur Koestler, in his starkly prophetic novel *Darkness at Noon*, described the contemporary species of post-Revolutionary Communist automata as "a generation without an umbilical cord." Koestler hardly intended to impart a mystical meaning to that phrase in a thoroughly unmystical book, and yet it aptly depicts the concept of "motherless men." Men as inhuman as if spawned by machines; utterly uninfluenced by any cultural traditions or by any vestige of Christian morality; the faceless end-products of an absolutist philosophy rooted in an ethic of sheer political expediency.

Repudiation of one's mother in the natural order is heinous enough, but to cut oneself off from the Mother of Grace is a gesture of despair in the supernatural order: it severs the cord of man's personal salvation. Communists hate Mary. Russians do not.

CHILDEN OF THE EARTH

The love of the true Russian for the soil of his native land is a strange, almost a terrible thing. When Napoleon's *grande armée* swept eastwards towards Borodino, the Russian peasant-soldier was summoned to defend neither the Tsar nor the French-minded aristocracy, but the good earth of his forefathers. The predatory Nazi hordes of the Third Reich were not described by Communist propaganda as a threat to the political superstructure of the U.S.S.R., but rather as sacrilegious violators of sacred Russian soil. The same note is currently being sounded *vis-à-vis* the alleged aims of "the imperialist West" to conquer Russian *land*.

This devotion of the ordinary Russian to his country's soil has a mystic quality impenetrable to the non-Russian mind. "Great Mother damp earth," writes Fr. Sergius Bulgakov, a noted author of the pre-Revolutionary days, "in thee we are born, by

thee we are nurtured, we touch thee with our feet, into thee we return. Children of the earth, love your mother, kiss it ecstatically, water it with your tears, bedew it with your sweat, fill it with your blood, feed it with your bones. For nothing is lost in it: the dumb memory of the world preserves everything and brings everything to life and fruition. He who does not love the earth, does not feel its motherhood, is a slave and an outlaw, a miserable rebel against his mother, the progeny of non-being."[1]

By an effortless transition, the Russian spirit passes from a veneration of the material earth and its motherhood to the ineffably mysterious reverence it harbors for the Virgin and her divine maternity. Fyodor Dostoyevsky (1822-81), surely one of the supremely great figures in Russian literature, is an articulate spokesman for much that is voiceless in the Russian spirit. His profound novels, especially *The Possessed*, *The Idiot* and *Crime and Punishment*, reflect his conviction that human life must be rooted in absolutes, anchored in God. To him, the Russian people are a "God-bearing" people, and the already ominous ground swells of revolution made Dostoyevsky fear that the individual, whose needs are of a spiritual order, must be degraded in a materialistic Socialist society.[2]

In *The Possessed*, Dostoyevsky describes how the Cripple, Marya Timofeyevna, is one day greeted by an old woman in front of the church.

"What is the Mother of God?" the crone whispered to Marya. "What do you think?"

Marya replied instantly, "The great Mother, the hope of the human race."

"Yes," Dostoyevsky has the wizened prophetess answer, "the Mother of God is the great Mother—the damp earth, and therein is found great joy for men."

What at first blush appears vague and a little shocking in these words, becomes clear and somehow very beautiful when Dostoyevsky's meaning is grasped. The sense of "earth" is that of primal element from which all flesh is taken: "And the Lord God

[1] *Svet Nevecherny* (Moscow, 1917), II, 1-2, p. 188. Translated in *Dostoyevsky*, by L. A. Zander (London: SCM Press, 1948), p. 47.

[2] Cf. Avrahm Yarmolinsky in the foreword to *The Possessed* (New York: Modern Library, 1936), p. VII.

formed man of the slime of the earth . . . " (*Gen.* 2:7), and unto which each man must ultimately return: "*Memento homo, quia pulvis es* . . . ." The natural mortality of all flesh is, in effect, counterbalanced by a kind of immortality proper to the earth itself. Creation is assured a mysterious cycle of permanency in the grandeur of an endlessly fertile soil that supports the life it has produced.

"A GARDEN ENCLOSED"

The adjective "damp" colors Dostoyevsky's thought with a deeply spiritual symbolism. Fruitfulness of the soil depends absolutely upon moisture: " . . . the rain is over and gone. The flowers have appeared in our land . . ." (*Cant.* 2:11-12). The marvelously productive power of the earth is thus conditioned on its receiving water, and so dampness becomes an indispensable link between mere inanimate nature and living things. A great mother: damp earth.

In all languages the earth's garden is called "mother"—she it is who receives the seed, conceives new life in virtue of it; nourishes it within her own moist body; yields a harvest in due season. In this sense too is Mother Church, Christ's bride, fruitful: "My sister, my spouse, is a garden enclosed, a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed up. . . . The fountain of gardens: the well of living waters, which run with a strong stream from Libanus" (*Cant.* 4:12-15).[3]

Mary is of the earth, earthy. The new Eve. One of us. Her sacred body possesses the power of conceiving human flesh: "Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son . . ." (*Luke* 1:31).

> In a natural way Eve, as mediatrix of the seed of the serpent, had brought forth sin in the man and thereby in the whole human race. Likewise in a supernatural way Mary, in her seed, that is, in the fruit of her body, brought into the world the personal bud of justice. . . . [4]

In her *fiat* all creation submitted itself anew to God. Because God condescended to take the earth-sprung form of the servant

[3] M. J. Scheeben in *Mariology* (St. Louis: Herder, 1947), II, 60-61, applies this to Mary.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

in the union of His divine Person with created human nature, therefore matter, represented by Mary, gave birth to the God-Man: "*Et Verbum caro factum est. . . .*" The Saviour springs from the earth, from Mary the fruitful soil.

When we recite the response: "*Virgo Israel, revertere ad civitates tuas . . . generabis Dominum Salvatorem, oblationem novam in terra . . .*"[5]—we but echo the plea of Isaias (45:8): "Drop down dew, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain the just: let the earth be opened, and bud forth a saviour. . . ." The Virgin Mary is incomparably the perfect expression of fruitful motherhood: the ultimate actualization of the potentialities implanted in nature by the Creator and brought to supernatural fruition by His life-giving graces.

This comparison between Christ's Mother and the bountiful good earth, as suggested by the texts of Dostoyevsky, is by no means artificial or irreverent. There is in it no *identification* of the impersonal Russian mother-soil and the personal Virgin Mother of God. It is simply pure and gracious analogy; a gentle figure of speech doing no violence to one's tenderest sensibility concerning the sanctity of Our Lady. Rather it portrays the heart of a fundamentally Christian writer endeavoring to enshrine, in a supremely artistic form, the Russian love for Mary.

Understood in this sense, the phrase: "the Mother of God is Mother damp earth" has a twofold signification. In a literal acceptation it affirms that Mary belongs to the same created world as the beloved soil of Russia, and remains united to it and to its people both in their sufferings and in their joys. In a metaphorical sense it means that by her fidelity to her special vocation: to bring God to men, she is the unique instrument chosen by God to accomplish the anointing of earth-bound humanity with the oil of divinity.[6]

"I AM THE TRUTH"

There is, moreover, a Christological implication in this likening of Mary to the earth. It is this: having once produced the Virgin who became the Mother of the Word of God made flesh, the earth still continues to bear the wheat for the bread and the

[5] Third lesson of Matins, fourth week of Advent.
[6] Cf. the illuminating remarks of L. A. Zander, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

grapes for the wine to preserve for men the eucharistic presence of Christ.

While Our Lady gave birth once to the visible Jesus, the good earth abidingly provides the elements which, until the end of time, will be transubstantiated into His sacramental Body and Blood. "Jesus took bread . . . and said: Take ye, and eat. This is my body. And taking the chalice . . . saying: Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood" (*Matt.* 26:26-28). The soil continues for mankind the work of Mary, for both Christ's nativity at Bethlehem and His unending sacramental rebirth upon the altar are bound up with our redemption and life.

Pushkin declared in his eulogy over the grave of Dostoyevsky: " . . . the destiny of the Russian people is universality acquired not by the sword, but by the strength of brotherhood, and by our desire to see the restoration of concord among all men."[7] That strength and brotherhood and concord can be won only through the acceptance of God as man's common Father; Christ as man's Elder Brother, and Mary as man's Mother. Neither the sword, nor cynical violence, nor "the big lie" will ever achieve Pushkin's dream of the destiny of the Russian people.

With strange appositeness (but in another context) the bitterly disillusioned Leon Trotsky wrote at the very end of a scathing indictment of the Communist methods to which he himself had helped give birth, "the motor force of progress is truth and not lies."[8] The only truth that can ultimately save Russia is the Truth who came to men from God through Mary: the fountain of gardens—the good damp earth.

"Love to throw yourself on the earth and kiss it," teaches Father Zossima in Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov.* "Kiss the earth, and love it with an unceasing, consuming love. Love all men, love everything. Seek that rapture and ecstasy. Water the earth with the tears of your joy and love those tears. Don't be ashamed of that ecstasy, prize it, for it is a gift of God and a great one: it is not given to many, but only to the elect."

[7] Quoted by Fulton J. Sheen, *Communism and the Conscience of the West* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1948), pp. 216-17. (Evidently not Aleksandr Pushkin whose dates are 1799-1837).

[8] *The Revolution Betrayed* (New York: Doubleday, 1937), p. 308.

Mary's love for Russia is no enigma wrapped in a riddle. It is her exquisitely maternal response to the Marian *élan* woven as a golden thread into the very warp and woof of the Russian soul. At Fatima only one nation was, so far as we know, elected as the object of Mary's special solicitude: Russia. "I come to ask the consecration of Russia to my Immaculate Heart," she declared. "Russia will be converted, if not, Russia will scatter her errors throughout the world."

Russia is not Our Lord's enemy. It is Communism: a vile intruder in the land of His Mother's icon.

AIDAN CARR, O.F.M.Conv.

St. Anthony-on-Hudson
Rensselaer, N.Y.

INDIVIDUAL CONVERSION RATHER THAN CORPORATE REUNION

Personal investigation of the Faith is an obligation which becomes operative the moment a person becomes aware of his position. This investigation is necessary in order that one obtain the gift of faith and no one may lawfully be swept into the Church in a mass movement unless he knows all that is involved in the act of faith and is prepared to assume freely all the obligations that go with membership in the Church. This may well involve the cross of foregoing lesser goods in view of obtaining the greater. Attachments which are civil, economic, cultural or social are undoubtedly strong, but they must take a secondary position to the will of God clearly seen. No human authority can relieve them of this obligation. The cords which bind them to their present position are human only; it is not true to say that any *grace* binds them thus. Every grace that they have received has been given in view of their conversion to the one Church of Christ.

—The Rev. Dr. Edward Francis Hanahoe, S.A., in *Catholic Ecumenism*, (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953), pp. 146 f.

JOTTINGS IN ITALY

The purpose of this article is to foster a more intelligent understanding of a people and a country that have contributed much to western civilizations. Even a few weeks' tour during a Roman pilgrimage three years ago made it clear that the Kremlin would like nothing better than to grasp this pearl of the Mediterranean once it has succeeded in dividing its people and crushing the present government. What we as Americans think of Italians, whether they be citizens of the new republic or our fellow countrymen, is going to have some bearing on better understanding of the complete picture—Italians abroad and Italian-Americans in this country.

Italians in this country have not perhaps "arrived" in material affluence and rightful prestige. But their patriotism in two wars and their marked growth in Catholic living is becoming more and more impressive. This patriotism and Catholic growth cannot be questioned. The younger Americans of Italian descent are winning respect and admiration. The old prejudices against Italian immigrants are disappearing. Why? Because Italians in all services of World Wars I and II have served America well, some of them as top-ranking heroes. Besides, priests and nuns of the new generation, most of them children of immigrants, are everywhere effectively fostering solid Catholicism and genuine American citizenship. Generally speaking, Italian-Americans are more Catholic-school-minded than their early immigrant parents. Lines of discrimination that were never really deeply drawn in seminaries and convents are rapidly disappearing. Italian-founded religious congregations are flourishing. The Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, to cite just one example, were established by Saint Frances Xavier Cabrini, who was actually sent by Pope Leo XIII to evangelize the foreign mission of Italian born immigrants.

Abroad, in spite of Italy's crazy-quilt government of the past one hundred years, recent trends towards a truly democratic government command the attention of careful observers even if the political picture itself is as yet somewhat uncertain.

The background of Italy's past is light and shadow. Although

nearly two thousand years of Christianity grace Italy's brow, her pagan background and the over-rapid christianization of early times must not be lost sight of. Her medieval glory, her saints, her Popes and her martyrs must never be overshadowed by the fact of her frequent political conflicts through the centuries. Nor is it fair to ignore the mistakes of her churchmen and the marauding character of the wolves before whom Italy was thrown in relatively recent times; specifically shortly before and after 1870. The years were at once Italy's somewhat silent martyrdom and her Babylonian captivity. The unification of Italy was then as it had been long before the Cavours and the Mazzinis a very desirable thing. But it did not have to come with such disastrous consequences to the nation itself and to the religion of a people whom their oppressors had already crushed into abject poverty. With the frenzied cry of a united Italy the anticlericals struck at the schools and at the seminaries, and then completed their diabolical job by separating the clergy from the laity. Had there been a powerful Catholic laity united to the clergy at the time it would have saved Italy from its own sordid political chaos and the people from the enemies of the religion they will always love.

One bad effect of all this business in Italy was the habit, especially among men, of neglecting Sunday Mass. This may have been occasioned by the lessening of its obligations under stress of a subtle and almost silent persecution. The habit had grown into positive defection until more recent religious instruction began to check the evil. The myth of a united Italy under the Masons tried to cloak over poverty and destitution. The camouflage could not last forever and the helpless government resorted to the flood of immigration which would have been a blessing in disguise had it not also emptied the Italian prisons and poured their inmates on American shores. Along with the good came also the wicked—bandits and what-not.

A slight digression may fit in here. The Irish Catholics were made stronger in Ireland by famine and persecution in spite of the intentions of the authors. They came with their priests, even if some of these gave American bishops, according to Guilday in *The Life and Times of John England*, many a bad headache. The growth and the faith of the Irish in spite of defections can never be doubted. Italy had no hedgerow schools and very few priests

were sent with the people. When the people came here the reception they got from American pastors was less than warm. (It seems to make some difference, does it not, that, whereas the persecution of the Irish was in the wide open Cromwellian style, that of the Italian anticlericals was secret, insidious and subtle?) But we must not forget that later on some of the first and best apostles among Italians were Irish-American priests. Msgr. Daniel Burke, and Fr. William Walsh of the Jesuits were outstanding examples in New York City.

I do not think that we should therefore be too hard on the Italians. Even though they were rushed to our shores in steerage pits together with renegades and criminals, hundreds of thousands of them fled from Italy because of the religious freedom the Stars and Stripes assured them. And they were coldly if not viciously neglected here for a long time. Yet is it not true that in so-called Catholic countries as everywhere else the rank self-complacency of having the blessings of the Faith unchallenged by difficulties shows up to be a delusion and a snare? In Italy it is feared that difficult times somewhat blurred the vision of some of the clergy who took too much for granted in the matter of necessary knowledge of the religion of the people and the assiduous practice of it. Self-security in Italy and everywhere needs a man like Giovanni Guareschi (*The Little World of Don Camillo*), who is laughing down the Communists and ridiculing the evil of smug complacency out of all of us.

But in 1948 the Italians came out of it. Priests and people, the young especially, weary of the crucial hardships of three wars, Ethiopia included, and threatened by an out-and-out conflict with the Reds, went to the polls to throw out the Hammer and Sickle. The event was almost as epochal as Spain's glorious victory over Moscow but it was not as conclusive. The fight is still on. The present government and its people are on firm ground for complete success. I am not sure that a similar opportunity had ever been given to the Italians before. Upon their strength and endurance now depends Italy's safety and stability.

On this side of the Atlantic the newly cherished freedom became license in the early days of immigration. The unreligious system of public schools in our country far from helped matters. It is true that no area in the country finds Italian groups who

have completely given up the faith. But ignorance and waywardness keep many only one step away from its denial. Apathy, neglect, unfriendliness of fellow Catholics and the evil work of a few ex-priests have done the rest.

Another thing. Our public school system is becoming more and more pagan. Highly respected Protestants who have no use for such un-American knavery as "Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State" agree with us in declaring that our public schools badly need religion if crime is to be attacked at its roots. Now the public schools in Italy, even when poisoned by anticlericals were more tolerable than our present public school system, because the atmosphere was still somewhat Catholic. The "public school" notion in the minds of Italian immigrants was easily transferred from Italy to America, probably without their realizing the difference; and the excellent parochial school system of our country was new to them. The harm to true education is therefore not fully grasped by some Italians even to this day. The children of these public-school-minded Catholics are also secular-college-minded. Observe to what colleges and universities some wealthy and renegade Italian Catholics condemn their sons and daughters.

It is by far more pleasing and impressive to say that the loyal remnant of true Catholic Italians in this country has vastly grown. The Italian-name population in every Catholic high school and college in the country is on the increase. May the old stigma of weakness in the life of Italian Catholics be completely wiped out. The trend is in that direction. While Catholic-born Italians trace their lineage to the saints and martyrs, the renegades among them, and they are few, can only glory in the paganism of the Caesars. Did not Mussolini try to fan that idea of Roman pagan culture into a flame of false patriotism? Whatever temporary and material benefits came to Italy, Mussolini's principles of government were wrongly motivated and singed with the brand of opportunism. They were never Catholic at the roots, and they were never, of course, truly democratic. The people had little or no say. Yet he managed to fool even some of the elect.

Casual tourists in Italy today easily seem to lend themselves to false conclusions about the religious spirit of Italians in Italy. I

do not want to say that in highly cosmopolitan cities like Rome, Florence, and Milan, one does not smell the stench that is pagan even in Catholic Italy. We sometimes have that in our own Catholic backyard right here.

Yet, the fervor of the faith of the Italians is clear and edifying everywhere in spite of first and fast tourist impressions. This is especially true in the small cities and towns. Italians are unfortunately often judged by the worst among them in Italy as also in America. The faults of a people always seem to be more evident than their virtues when a country is reputedly almost entirely Catholic. Would not American Catholics be very much more on the spot if they were all isolated into one state?

GABRIEL A. ZEMA, S.J.

St. Ignatius House of Studies
Manhasset, L. I., N.Y.

THE NAME "YAHWEH"

God did wish the Hebrews to worship Him under a name which was that of their God and no other. Thus Israel might gather round the Lord their God and fight His battles; and since El, which had become a common name for other nations, could not longer fulfil such a purpose, God condescended to take a proper name whereby to rally His people. The name which henceforth takes the place of the ancient El is a name which expresses existence by excellence, the plenitude of being. With Him no other being can be associated as possessing attributes or powers which are not in Him. Such is the meaning of the Divine Name as interpreted, simply in the light of the Biblical record, and apart from all merely personal speculation.

—The late Father M. J. Lagrange, O.P., in the article "The Revealed Form of the Holy Name," in *AER*, XX, 6 (June, 1899), 599.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE HOLY SHROUD

PART II

THE SHROUD AND BYZANTINE ART

How do we know that the Shroud of Lirey-Turin is identical with that of Constantinople? Here Dr. Hynek accepts another questionable theory—first put forward, it seems, by Msgr. Arthur S. Barnes.[39]

At the bottom of the so-called Byzantine Cross there is a slanting bar representing the foot-rest. This bar is said to be slanted because it was believed that Christ was lame in one leg, and this belief is supposed to have been inspired by the Shroud, where one leg (the right, which really corresponds to the left leg of Christ) appears to be shorter than the other because of a bend in the knee. The Byzantine Cross is particularly prevalent in Russia, which was evangelized towards the end of the tenth century by missionaries from Constantinople. There, says Dr. Hynek, the Shroud was well known and served as the model of the Byzantine Cross. The Shroud of Turin, therefore, with that apparently short right leg in the imprint, must be the same as the relic that was venerated at Constantinople.

Msgr. Barnes is rather moderate as to the value he ascribes to this theory. "I would draw no conclusion," he says, "and enter into no argument, for I recognize that the evidence is not conclusive."[40]

Dr. Hynek is more positive: "Now this mistake [the supposed deduction from the imprints that the right leg of Christ was short] is of immense importance, for it proves the identity of the Constantinople Shroud—so familiar to the Christian East—with that of Turin" (p. 13).

For him, the origin of the slanted lower bar of the Byzantine Cross is a demonstrated fact, as is also the reason for the later development of the "Byzantine Curve" of the corpus of the Crucified. This is supposed to have been introduced when artists began to depict Christ with the feet nailed side by side to a level

[39] A. S. Barnes, *The Holy Shroud of Turin* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1934), pp. 64-69.

[40] *Op. cit.*, p. 66.

foot-rest. The shorter right leg, says Dr. Hynek, caused a curvature of the whole body to the left, and this was in turn balanced by a leaning of the head to the right.

The force of all this as a proof depends entirely on the original assumption. Did observers of the Shroud at Constantinople deduce from the imprints that Christ was lame? There is good reason for saying that the evidence is far from conclusive.

First, there is the uncertainty as to when the Shroud arrived in Constantinople. It was in 1171 that our first eye-witness saw it there. This was William of Tyre who, in company with King Amaury I of Jerusalem, was present at a private showing of the relics contained in the imperial treasury, among them the Shroud.[41] The Byzantine Cross, on the other hand, was developed long before the year 1000.

Secondly, was the Shroud a familiar object of veneration from the time of its arrival in Constantinople, whenever that may have been? It seems not. William of Tyre relates that the Shroud was among the treasures kept in the private chambers of the Emperor, and that the Greeks were amazed that King Amaury and his entourage were admitted into that reserved part of the palace. The visitors, however, do not seem to have seen the Shroud unfolded so as to display the imprints. William does not mention the imprints, whereas he would surely have done so had he seen them.

In 1201 Nicholas Mesarites defended the imperial chapel during a sedition led by John Comnenus, and on that occasion drew up an inventory of the relics under his custody. He describes the Shroud as of ordinary linen and still redolent of myrrh, but neither does he refer to the imprints.[42] In view of the detailed entry that he made in his catalogue, it seems incredible that he would have failed to mention the two life-size figures of the Lord, if he had seen them.

Vignon concludes that the Shroud was kept folded in a receptacle; and that the practice of exhibiting it every Friday, attested by Robert de Clari, began only after the Emperor made his

[41] *Willermi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi historiae, lib.* XX, *cap.* XXIII, in *Recueil des histoires des croisades* (Paris, 1844), *Histoires occidentaux*, I, 2e partie, 985.

[42] A. Heisenberg, *Die Palastrevolution des Johannes Komnenos* (Würzburg, 1907), p. 30, as cited by Paul Vignon, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

residence in the palace of Blachernes. That would be during the two or three years before the pillage of Constantinople—much too late for the Shroud to have suggested the slanted foot-rest of the Byzantine Cross because of a belief in the lameness of Christ.

Thirdly, one may doubt whether any intelligent observer would be led by the Shroud to think that the right leg of Christ was really shorter than the left. One who sees the two figures in their natural size as they are on the Shroud, can see very well that the right knee is bent, causing only an apparent shortening of the leg. I have in my possession photos of the two images enlarged to their true dimensions. In the positive photo of the dorsal image the bend in the knee is unmistakable—more so than in the original photo where the dimensions are considerably reduced, though there also it is clear enough. Artists particularly would be likely to take this into account in modelling a crucifix according to the data of the Shroud. In fact, they would see at once that the feet had been crossed and nailed together without any foot-rest.

It would seem, then, that some other explanation must be found for the origin of the slanting foot-rest of the Byzantine Cross and the tortured Byzantine Curve of the corpus. One can hardly prove in this way that the Shroud of Turin is the same as that of Constantinople.

Dr. Hynek bases a similar argument on a mosaic in S. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna. This, he says, represents "the seated Christ with his right leg, or rather the right knee, crippled, whereas, the image of Christ standing is without blemish: and this is entirely true to nature, for in a standing position it is possible to hide this blemish by an adjustment of the pelvis" (p.14).

It is for competent judges to decide whether the seated Christ is really represented with a crippled knee. In any case, the mosaics in S. Apollinare Nuovo are dated much earlier than the Byzantine Cross, so it is much less likely that the alleged portrayal of lameness might have been derived from the Shroud while it was at Constantinople.

Dr. Hynek has one other argument to bridge the gap between Constantinople and Lirey-Turin. The nudity of the body in the imprints, he says, is a fact of great historical importance when seen in relation to the report of Nicholas Mesarites, who states that the linen preserved in the imperial chapel had enveloped

the naked body of the Saviour. And here is Dr. Hynek's conclusion: "Could there be stronger proof of the identity of the Constantinople Shroud with that of Lirey, Chambery and, in our day, Turin? Yet Canon Chevalier, with his insistence on a forgery, entirely ignores this impressive piece of evidence" (p. 31).

Canon Chevalier might have answered that Mesarites did not see the imprints and does not refer to them, so he cannot supply any very impressive piece of evidence for the identity of the Shroud. His statement need not imply anything more than the perfectly natural assumption that, while reposing in the tomb, the body of Christ had no other covering than the linen winding-sheet.

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF THE SHROUD

There is now less reason than ever for such hazardous speculations and bold assertions since Vignon has published a remarkable iconographic study which has real historical value with regard to our present question.[43] He has shown, with an abundance of excellent illustration, that the imprint of the face on the Shroud was the model of the image of the Holy Face in many ancient paintings and mosaics. In these works there are certain anomalies which no artist would ever have introduced into a picture of the human countenance unless he had a compelling reason. They are peculiarities and accidents of the imprint of the face on the Shroud—marks of identity as definite and characteristic as a signature.

The earliest of these artistic works was the celebrated image known as the Holy Face of Edessa—long since destroyed, but survived by a whole lineage of derived works which reproduce the characteristics of the Shroud.[44] This places the Shroud of Turin in the early fifth century.

Later works done at Constantinople show the same revealing marks. Among these there is one—the Holy Face of Laon—which must have been done by an artist with the Shroud itself before his eyes, probably at the time when the Shroud was lodged at Blachernes.[45] It reproduces a variety of the peculiar details of the imprint, so unique, so minute and exact, that they could have been derived from no other source. This identifies the Shroud of

[43] *Op. cit.*, pp. 123-86, 211-25.
[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 123-27.
[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 183-86, fig. 86.

Turin as that of Constantinople, and it does so more surely than would a written document over which critics might dispute.

In a brief reference to Vignon's iconographic study, Dr. Hynek gives a false impression of its significance, apparently failing to realize that it is a notable contribution to the history of the Shroud and a new chapter in the history of Christian art.

Vignon's iconographic thesis is the final blow to the principal historical objection of the opponents—that the Shroud was painted in the middle of the fourteenth century, at the time when it appeared in Lirey. That objection was already sufficiently absurd in view of two unquestionable facts—that the images on the Shroud are very exact negatives, and that they are the imprints of a human corpse—but Vignon has now refuted it on strictly historical grounds. Dr. Hynek, on the other hand, still attempts to refute the historical objection of the opponents with the discredited documents and the baseless conjectures which were current among defenders of the Shroud in an earlier period.

THE VEIL OF VERONICA

Dr. Hynek treats another artistic question in relation to the Shroud—that of the Veil of Veronica—one of the most vexed and confused problems in the whole field of Christian iconography. Just to read the documents collected by Ernst von Dobschuetz, and to try to reduce them to some sort of order, is a formidable task. Dr. Hynek, however, seems to have no difficulty, either about the image which he supposes to be on the Veil, or about its relationship with the Shroud.

He says there is an image still to be seen on the Veil, and he describes it in the following terms:

> It is, to be exact, the mask of the face, made like an ikon. It is long and narrow, with closed eyes and a long nose; the ears are hidden, the beard divided in three—a very important fact, as we shall see. The marks of injuries are plainly visible. . . . Five tears lie in a line along the eyelids. . . . The face is of the Byzantine type, with a symmetrical triple beard, a long nose, and a swelling on the right cheek (pp. 28-29).

He is definite enough in his conclusion: "It is my contention that the face on the Veil of Veronica corresponds exactly with that of the Shroud of Turin, and was copied from it either in the first centuries A.D., or in the Middle Ages" (p. 28).

Now Dr. Hynek is speaking of the Veil preserved in the Veronica chapel in St. Peter's, Rome, high up within one of the massive pillars supporting the dome. Nobody but a few Canons, and they only on rare occasions, is ever allowed to enter there. Even the archaeologist Raffaele Garrucci was not admitted. Recently I met with the same failure. It is true that once a year, on Holy Thursday, the Veil is set out on the balcony of the Veronica chapel; but at that distance, and with candle-light reflected from the glass covering the Veil, it is impossible even with binoculars to see what may be upon the cloth. However, it is not necessary for one to see for himself. The mystery of the Veil has been definitely solved, and it is a surprising climax to a strange story.

First, we have a description of the Veil by a scholar who specialized in the iconography of the Way of the Cross—Barbier de Montault, who was able to examine the Veil in the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament on December 8, 1854. Here is his report:

> The Holy Face is enclosed in a square silver frame under a thick glass. A metal plate covers the space within the frame, allowing only the face to be seen, the contours of which it delineates. From these sharply defined contours one surmises long hair falling to the shoulders, and a short beard divided into two sparse tufts. The rest of the features is so vaguely outlined, or rather so completely effaced, that I had to make the greatest effort to perceive traces of the eyes and the nose. In a word, one sees only a darkened surface which does not show the form of a human face.[46]

Writing a few years after Barbier, Garrucci says it was common rumor that the Veil in St. Peter's was so discolored that there remained at most a faint shadow of an image.[47] On the basis of some ancient copies, he attempted a reconstruction. It is a picture of the living Christ with eyes open and without any traces of wounds or blood.[48] Though the copies are inaccurate, says Garrucci, they all agree in these two details.

As we shall see in a moment, Barbier was mistaken in surmising long hair and a two-pointed beard under the metal covering,

[46] Barbier de Montault, "Iconographie du chemin de la croix," *Annales Archéologiques*, XXIII (1863), 232.

[47] Raffaele Garrucci, *Storia della Arte Cristiana nei primi otto secoli della Chiesa* (Prato: Gaetano Guasti, 1876), III, 8-9.

[48] *Ibid.*, plate 106, no. 2.

and in thinking that he perceived faint traces of eyes and a nose on the darkened cloth. Garrucci was likewise mistaken in supposing that the copies on which he based his reconstruction represented an image which had been upon the Veil from the beginning. The real nature of the Veil was finally disclosed by Msgr. Joseph Wilpert, recognized as the leading expert on the ancient mosaics and paintings of the churches in Rome, Professor at the Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, and a member of the Commission of the Holy Shroud. He received permission from the Blessed Pius X to examine the Veil, and here is what he discovered.[49]

After removing the metal covering and two glass plates, he saw a square piece of cloth yellowed with age. Upon the cloth there were two dim stains of unequal size, rust-brown in color and joined together. No image, no remnants of any image.

Msgr. Wilpert points out that the appearance of the cloth corresponds to the terms in which medieval witnesses refer to the Veil, representing it as a relic, but not as an image of Christ. Two of these witnesses were Canons of St. Peter's who wrote in the middle of the twelfth century. *Sudarium Christi quod vocatur Veronica*, one of them calls it. The other says that this is the *sudarium* with which Christ, before His Passion, wiped His holy face, when His sweat became as drops of blood falling to the ground.

In the following century witnesses no longer speak simply of a napkin with blood-stains. They now speak emphatically of an image of Christ. This was not because the cloth was more carefully observed, says Msgr. Wilpert, but because a fabric with an image had been placed over the original cloth.

Though it is now lost, we know what this new image was like. About the same time a similar "restoration" took place with the image of Christ still preserved in the oratory of the Scala Sancta, then part of the Lateran palace. Gervasius of Tilbury, a contemporary, says that the Veronica of St. Peter's was not unlike (*non absimile*) the image of Christ at the Lateran. Msgr. Wilpert was able to examine the latter also and gives us a good repro-

[49] Joseph Wilpert, *Die roemischen Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV. bis XIII. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg i. B: Herder, 1916), II, 1123-25.

duction.[50] It is a picture of the living Christ, with an oval face, with abnormally large eyes wide open, a straight, narrow nose, a poorly formed mustache, a short, unparted beard, and without any marks of suffering. It must have been copies of the similar image at St. Peter's that Garrucci took as the basis of his reconstruction of the supposedly original image of the Veil.

In contrast with the enthusiastic cult it enjoyed during the Middle Ages, the image superposed upon the Veil came to an inglorious end. It was looted from St. Peter's during the sack of Rome in 1527, and was offered for sale in the taverns of the Eternal City.[51] Nothing more is known of it, and one need not deplore its loss. Ever since there has remained in St. Peter's only the original cloth—the *sudarium Christi quod vocatur Veronica*, with its two formless, rust-brown stains which have not even the appearance of an image.

How, then, could Dr. Hynek give such a definite, detailed description and say that this is the image of the Veil of Veronica? Obviously, he confuses the Veil itself with an alleged copy which bears the following inscription in Latin: "The true image of Our Lord Jesus Christ which is preserved and venerated at Rome in the Basilica of St. Peter." This is an engraving printed on cloth and diffused throughout the world as a facsimile of the Holy Face of the Veil of Veronica. It is also known as the Holy Face of Tours because it was adopted by the Confraternity of the Holy Face, which has its center at Tours. According to Barbier, the engraving was made about the middle of the eighteenth century. It cannot, of course, have any relationship with the Veil. From an iconographic point of view, says Barbier, it has no value.[52]

This, then, is the image which, Dr. Hynek contends, was copied from the Shroud either in the first centuries A.D., or in the Middle Ages. Moreover, he gives a photometric proof of the identity of the two images which to him seems irrefutable. He superposed two films—one a negative of the alleged Veronica image, the other the negative image of the face on the Shroud, both

[50] *Ibid.*, II, 1110, fig. 523. Cf. also Hartmann Grisar, *Die roemische Kapelle Sancta Sanctorum und ihr Schatz* (Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1908), p. 41, fig. 18.

[51] Ludwig Pastor, *Geschichte der Paepste*, 1-4 ed. (1907), Bd. IV, Abt. 2, p. 279.

[52] *Loc. cit.*

images being on the same scale. Then he made a composite print and found that the measurements of the cranium, face, nose, eye-sockets, and the rest, corresponded exactly.[53] He concludes that the image of the Veil and that of the Shroud are one and the same, though he assumes that the artist "improved" the faint outlines of the imprint on the Shroud while retaining the same dimensions and type.

It is highly interesting to note that the same experiment was performed in 1916 by Jean Brierre, an amateur photographer of Angers.[54] The result is about the same, minor differences being due to the fact that Brierre used the photo of the Shroud taken in 1898.

It must be admitted that the correspondence of the measurements of the two images is no accident, but what does it prove? Certainly not that there is an image on the Veil in St. Peter's identical with that of the Shroud. The Holy Face of Tours does not even resemble the spurious image superposed upon the Veil in the thirteenth century. The most that we can conclude is that the artist who made the engraving about the year 1750 must have had the Shroud as his model, but that has no particular significance. We know that many copies and adaptations were made while the Shroud was at Chambery and after its transfer to Turin. The only thing notable about the Holy Face of Tours is that it is so generally, and so trustfully, accepted as the image of the Veronica at St. Peter's—an image which never existed on that particular piece of cloth.

PROOF OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SHROUD

Whatever has been gleaned from history, either through written documents or through iconography, is only a confirmation of the authenticity of the Shroud. On this basis alone, one cannot prove that the Shroud of Turin is the burial cloth of Christ, and it is a grave error to make the attempt. The real proof consists in the evidence visible on the Shroud itself, compared with the

[53] The author reproduces the composite photo in *Golgotha im Zeugnis des Turiner Grabtuches* (Karlsruhe: Badenia Verlag, 1950), facing p. 68; *Golgothas Geheimnis und Tage der Vergeltung* (Muenchen: Alois Girnth Verlag, 1951), facing p. 257.

[54] Joseph de Joannis, "Le Saint Suaire et la Sainte Face," *Etudes*, CLII (1917), 600-601.

Gospel record of the Passion, the burial and the resurrection of Christ. The two life-size figures are the imprints of a dead man who bore the same extraordinary series of torments as is recorded of Christ, who was given the same exceptional burial, and who emerged from his winding-sheet after the same lapse of time—before corruption could attack his body and destroy the winding-sheet with its imprints. Altogether, the evidence is sufficiently complete, clear and conclusive to identify the Man of the Shroud as Christ.

To realize the force of this proof, one must have scrutinized every detail of the imprints with meticulous care and with the one purpose of seeing what is really there. One must also have studied the Gospel texts, and the related historical questions, with equal care and without prejudice for or against the Shroud.

In neither of these respects does Dr. Hynek distinguish himself. He seems to be a careless and imaginative observer, and he treats scriptural and historical questions almost as if they were a game of blindman's buff. He ignores difficulties and objections, and is apparently disposed to accept almost any argument so long as it is in favor of the Shroud. He is also inaccurate in reporting the opinions of others, in some cases ascribing to them views that they never expressed. I can select only a few points that invite comment.

THE SCOURGING

Among the wounds of the scourgings, besides the long stripes across the shoulders and around the legs, there are many others, about three centimeters long, which have the shape of a dumbbell. These, says Dr. Hynek, are always in pairs, and they are eighty in number, which would correspond to forty blows (p. 45).

As a matter of fact these wounds are not always in pairs. Many of them appear singly. And the wounds are so distributed that the scourge could have been composed of three thongs of unequal length. It is really very difficult, if not impossible, to compute how many strokes of the scourge are represented by the marks of the wounds.

Like other authors, Dr. Hynek speaks of forty blows with the scourge because that number was prescribed by the Mosaic Law (*Deut.* 25:3), though in practice it was reduced to thirty-nine, as in the case of St. Paul (II *Cor.* 11:24). This, however, is ir-

relevant to the Shroud, for there the traces of the wounds indicate far more than forty strokes. It is irrelevant also to the case of Christ, for He was scourged by the Romans, with whom there was no limit as to the number of blows that might be dealt in a judicial scourging.

The form of the wounds—long stripes and that peculiar shape of a dumbbell—makes it possible to reconstruct the scourge. Dr. Hynek seems to think that either one of two different reconstructions may be correct. According to Malijay, there were two thongs, and these he describes as broad, flat straps, each weighted with two metal balls connected by a small bar at right angles to the strap.[55] According to Vignon, there were three thongs, thin and round, with two metal balls fixed lengthwise to the end of each at an interval of about three centimeters.[56] The imprints of the wounds on the Shroud correspond to Vignon's reconstruction and exclude Malijay's.

One cannot be very certain about the number of thongs, though three seems more likely. The rest, however, is clear enough. The lacerations on the shoulders and around the legs were caused by light, cutting thongs, not by flat straps. The "dumbbells" lie in a longitudinal direction, that is, in line with the thongs, not at right angles, as would be the case with Malijay's scourge. Vignon demonstrated the correctness of his reconstruction by beating a receptive surface with his scourge and reproducing the precise form and position of the wounds as imprinted on the Shroud. From archaeological data he has shown that the Romans actually used a scourge like the one that he reconstructed from the imprints.

THE CROWN OF THORNS

"Thou art then a king? Thou sayest it; I am a king" (*John* 18:37). This assertion of royalty was construed into the charge for which Christ was finally condemned to crucifixion. It was also the reason for the inhuman mockery of the crown of thorns, which has remained ever since an emblem distinguishing Christ from all other victims of the cross.

The Shroud bears eloquent witness to that sad emblem of a royalty not of this world. The imprint of the head is strongly

[55] N. Noguier de Malijay, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60, figs. 25, 26.
[56] P. Vignon, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-60, figs. 27, 28.

marked with drops and trickles of blood which came from deep punctures and portray the appalling reality of the crowning with thorns. They also show the pattern of the plaited crown.

Dr. Hynek says that the crown was a circlet, and that the bloodstains correspond exactly to the maximum width of the head, extending round the forehead and the projections of the occipital bone (pp. 38, 40). The bloodstains show rather that the crown was a network covering the head like a helmet. This is in accord with the word (πλέκτω) used by the evangelists to signify the "weaving" of the crown (*Matt.* 27:29; *Mark* 15:17; *John* 19:2). Besides the punctures at the front, the back of the head was punctured at many points, from the top almost to the nape of the neck. Most of the blood clotted in the thick, matted hair and does not at all correspond to the line of the cranium around the forehead and the projections of the occipital bone.

There were comparatively few punctures on the brow, where we see only four large drops of blood and a trickle in the form of a reversed 3. The rest of the blood at the front of the head was held in the hair and came from punctures of the scalp.

Dr. Hynek, therefore, is not correct in saying that there are many marks of bleeding "on the confines between hair and brow," and that this bleeding was caused "by innumerable thorns that pierced the blood vessels and—while Our Lord was alive—sent the blood down in streams. The eyebrows intercepted some of these streams of blood . . . " (p. 38). The effects of the crowning with thorns as shown on the Shroud are impressive enough without such obvious misstatements.

Dr. Hynek is probably right in maintaining that the crown of thorns remained on the head of Christ throughout the crucifixion, but need one suppose that it was twice removed and replaced during the Passion? And should one attempt to prove that it remained on the head to the end with an argument like the following? "We know this from the imprints, where we see the separate little rivulets of venous blood flowing down the hair at the back of the head from wounds which the vertical beam of the cross had enlarged" (p. 39). Is it possible to tell from the imprints whether or not the wounds under the matted hair were enlarged by pressure against the upper projection of the cross?

Dr. Hynek remarks that there was more profuse bleeding on the left side of the back of the head (the right side on the Shroud).

This is true, and no doubt it indicates that here there were more thorns puncturing the scalp, but again Dr. Hynek goes too far with this conclusion: "To avoid the pressure of thorny branches on the cross Our Lord was obliged to keep His head bent forward to the right; as He died, his head fell forward and His neck muscles stiffened in this position" (p. 40).

Why should one suppose that Our Lord was compelled to bend His head to the right? Forward would have been sufficient to avoid pressing against the cross with any part of the head.

In the imprints the head is perfectly straight. In fact, in the dorsal image, it appears to lean slightly to the left because the right shoulder is lower than the other. The head is straight, however, in relation to the axis of the body.

That is all we can tell from the imprints. Whether or not the head was adjusted before being enveloped in the Shroud, is problematical. In any case, falling forward of its own weight, the head would have leaned neither to the right nor to the left. This is in accord with the manner in which the head is balanced on the spinal column. This was also demonstrated by Dr. Barbet in an experiment with a human corpse.

But there is something else involved. Dr. Hynek wishes to exclude the use of a chin-band to bind up the mouth at the burial, so he continues: "Our Lord's head, then, was bent forwards to the right, its weight resting on the chin and thereby automatically closing the mouth . . . this automatic closing of the mouth rendered the use of a chin-strap unnecessary." We shall see below that this is disproved by Dr. Barbet's experiment.

In view of the sacredness of the subject and the peculiar significance of every detail, one might expect greater accuracy in the description of the data of the Shroud, and a wholesome restraint from theories that conflict with the imprints and with elementary scientific facts.

THE CARRYING OF THE CROSS

According to Dr. Hynek, we are left with mere guesswork and speculation regarding the manner of carrying the cross in ancient times, so he proceeds to guess and speculate, with some startling results.

Here is how he describes the carrying of the cross as practiced among the Romans. Immediately after the sentence was passed,

the cross was laid upon the condemned, with the transverse beam lying across the shoulders. To this the outstretched hands were nailed. The condemned was then driven through the streets with the long perpendicular beam dragging behind. It is thus that Christ is supposed to have been led to Calvary (p. 54).

But then Dr. Hynek agrees with Dr. Judica's deduction from the Shroud. According to the latter, the whole cross was borne on the right shoulder, as is traditionally depicted in art. He supposes that at each fall of Our Lord the whole weight of the cross fell on His back, the transverse beam striking and injuring the left shoulder-blade (p. 44).

How are these two conceptions to be reconciled? Dr. Hynek neglects to tell his readers.

The truth is that in this question we have something more than mere guesswork and speculation, as may be seen from Father Holzmeister's monograph,[57] which Dr. Hynek himself calls "a carefully compiled collection of quotations and references from the writers of antiquity" (p. 54). It is supplemented with other significant citations by Vignon in his painstaking study of the carrying of the cross.[58]

Some of the texts apparently refer to the punishment of the yoke or the pillory, under which the culprit was driven through the streets with scourges—a punishment entirely distinct from the carrying of the cross by those condemned to crucifixion. Other texts, however, refer to the sad prelude of execution on the cross. They describe the condemned as carrying only the transverse beam, which lay across both shoulders with the outstretched hands bound to it. Father Holzmeister sees an allusion to this mode of carrying the cross in the words of Our Lord to Peter: " 'when thou art old thou wilt stretch forth thy hands, and another will gird thee, and lead thee where thou wouldst not.' Now this he said to signify by what manner of death he should glorify God" (*John* 21:18-19). On an earlier occasion Christ had hinted that, like Himself, Peter would be crucified (*John* 13:36).

[57] U. Holzmeister, *Crux Domini atque crucifixio quomodo ex archaeologia romana illustrentur* (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1934), pp. 17-18.

[58] *Op. cit.*, pp. 48-52.

Dr. Hynek calls this an entirely new and revolutionary picture of the carrying of the cross (p. 42). It is new only to one who has not grasped the meaning of the ancient writers, or who does not know the state of opinion among scholars, beginning with Justus Lipsius.[59] And it is revolutionary only to one who takes his own fantasy for fact, or attempts to settle this historical question by the idealized portrayal of art, begun centuries after crucifixion had been abolished and the manner of carrying the cross forgotten.

The imprints on the Shroud are in accord with the testimony of the historical witnesses. They have been misinterpreted by Dr. Judica. On the one hand, at the top of the shoulders there is no trace of any injury such as would have been caused by the carrying of a complete cross. We see there the stripes of the scourging, but the flesh was otherwise intact. This is particularly true of the right shoulder. On the other hand, on each shoulder-blade there is evidence of a rather extensive abrasion. It is the sort of effect that would be caused by the friction of a rough, heavy burden like the transverse beam of a cross. There are also traces of an abundant oozing from the abraded flesh, such as would continue after the friction had ceased. Moreover, it is clear that the abrasion took place after the scourging, for in this area the wounds inflicted by the scourge were altered, aggravated, some of them almost obliterated. In the case of the Man of the Shroud, as in that of Christ, everything points to the carrying of the cross-beam only.

One need not be disturbed by the fact that the Shroud differs from popular belief and the tradition of art. In this respect as in others, the Shroud is different because it is in accord with historical fact. It does not represent the conception of any human artist; it bears the imprints of the Saviour with His wounds as they were actually graven upon His sacred flesh.

(To be continued)

EDWARD A. WUENSCHEL, C.SS.R.

Collegium Maius S. Alfonsi
Rome

[59] *Justi Lipsii opera omnia postremum ab ipso aucta et recensita* (Vesaliae, 1675), III, *De cruce libri tres, lib.* II, *cap.* V, 1179; *lib.* III, *cap.* III-V, 1195-99.

QUODLIBETAL QUESTIONS

Part IV

A GREAT PRAYER

The great prayers of the Church illustrate the maxim, *Ecclesia orans, ecclesia docens*, and in many instances they are also works of high art. In them thought, feeling, aspiration, and resolution are given an outward form that has strength of structure, grace of movement, and beauty of ornament. Sometimes such utterances are the work of a single hand, and of them the *Our Father* is the supreme example. The *Suscipe, Domine* of St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Alphonsus de' Liguori's act of spiritual communion are lesser instances. No doubt most of the great orations of the missal and the breviary also belong to this class. Certain great prayers cannot be assigned to a single author, but have developed through centuries of use during which many hands had their part in bringing about a final perfection. The *Hail Mary* attained its present form in such a way, and there are many other prayers that have been added to, condensed, clarified, strengthened, or refined in the course of years.

The full character of these great prayers is not always seen by us. It may be that constant use leads us to take them for granted, so that we lose sight of their merits as works of art and as syntheses of the deepest truths. One such prayer is the traditional act of contrition. Its history is very likely long and intricate; there must have been many restatements of its essential thought before it reached its present form. Even within our own time changes have been made in authoritative versions, and doubtless other changes will be made in the future. But as it stands, or as it may be stated, the act of contrition has such a mature perfection that it is difficult to think of any further change that is needed. That it has reached a complete and perfect shape and that it possesses high artistry as well as depth and fullness of thought may be seen to best advantage if it is put into something like verse form.

O my God,
I am heartily sorry for all my sins,
because
I dread the loss of heaven,
the pains of hell,
and all Thy just punishments;
but most of all because
I have offended Thee,
who art
all good
and deserving of all my love.
I firmly resolve,
with the help of Thy grace,
to confess my sins,
to do penance,
and to amend my life.
Amen

The act of contrition rightly begins with a statement of fact. I admit that I am a sinner, and state that I am repentant and that I am sorry for all my sins without exception. Not only is this given as a fact, but in a way it is what Aristotle calls a reasoned fact. The things that impel me to be sorry for my sins are listed in a logical order. There is first of all the salutary fear of punishment, and the greatest of punishments for serious sin is properly given at the very head of the list: the loss of heaven, of everlasting life and eternal happiness with God. Then comes the second most grievous punishment: everlasting death and the eternal pains of hell. Thirdly, a complete account of this group of reasons will name God's lesser punishments for wrong-doing. I should be sorry for my sins because of the punishments due to them in purgatory and because of others that will inevitably come to me in this life. "The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom," and the Church always strives to keep this before our minds. In this first group of reasons for repentance may be found a most accurate reading of human nature. Most of us are first moved by a fear of affliction and loss. This is true both in the natural order and in the supernatural order. It is false psychology as well as false theology to minimize or deny this salutary fear of punishment. To repudiate the loss of heaven, the dread of eternal damnation, and the thought of temporal punishment in this world and in the world to come as motives for repentance is something that we do only at our greatest peril.

Because the Church sees the whole truth, this fear of just punishment, high as it is as a motive for repentance, is followed by a reason that is still higher. "But most of all," the prayer goes on, I must repent because my sins are offenses against almighty God. Here again the reasoned fact is illustrated in a most explicit way. These sins are crimes against Him who is "all-good and deserving of all my love." Attrition, imperfect contrition, repentance called forth by a salutary fear, sorrow because of a legitimate but lower reason, is succeeded by perfect contrition. This new and higher sorrow is aroused by a love of God for His own sake and by a perception of my ingratitude to Him. A lawful and praiseworthy concern for self has been followed by a nobler motivation. A licit egoism has been succeeded by a most complete and disinterested altruism. In this altruism the "other" is infinitely other, God Himself, who is infinitely good and who loves me with an infinite love.

The Church does not let us cling to the past, nor does it permit us to remain content with the present. This fact of repentance, with the clear statement of all the tremendous reasons for it, must be followed by a concern for the future. The acts of thought and will with regard to the past give place to acts of thought and will that look to what is to come. Therefore a resolution to do better is made with the clear recognition that all its efficacy depends on God's grace. This resolution is detailed and explicit. It is that I will make a sacramental confession and that I will follow up that confession with acts of penance. Even our highest acts of thought and will are not enough, and to fulfill the demands of our nature we must perform external acts. Usually it is necessary for us to give outward as well as inward expression to our sorrow for our evil deeds. Hence I must promise to do certain things by way of reparation for past offenses. Finally, I must give a further pledge with regard to my future conduct. This pledge to amend my life is the peaceful conclusion of the full act of contrition.

The Church's realism is evident in every line of this great prayer. Many, perhaps most, prayers are spoken in the plural because on most occasions and for most of our intentions we should pray with others and for others, even if they are not physically present. But the act of contrition, like the *Confiteor*, is put in the first person singular. It is my own sins that I must count and ad-

mit and be sorry for. It is only my own reasons for repentance that I can know and that I must state. It is only my own resolution and hope that I can speak of. Taken together, true theology and sound philosophy constitute the most comprehensive view of things that is possible to men. Here in the act of contrition we have evidence of this. When a man says this prayer sincerely, he knows himself for what he is and for what he ought to be. The true relation between intellect and will is brought out and put to use. The place of nature along with that of grace is recognized. The soul stands before God, and the highest realities of this life and of the next are made clear: personal responsibility, the need for faith, hope, and charity along with repentance, the last judgment, heaven, hell, and purgatory. There is adoration as well as penance here, but there is no petition except for God's pardon and grace.

That the act of contrition is a work of art becomes evident when we reflect upon it. It has a beginning, a middle, and an end, which are necessary, as Aristotle indicates, for every literary work of magnitude, and this prayer has magnitude of theme if not of size. It possesses symmetry of form and it moves with ease and grace. It is an instance of great economy in the means used to reach the end in view, for there is not a word wasted here nor is there a word too few. It has complete clarity both in its individual words and in its total message. It is definite and precise. Its forthright references to "the loss of heaven" and "the pains of hell" are far more powerful and convincing than are abstract generalities about punishment. The prayer has unity and truth, and because it has unity and truth it also has goodness. It is good both as a means to the end for which it was made and good in itself as a thing of strength and beauty.

DEMOCRITUS REDIVIVUS

The name of Pierre Gassendi does not stand high in the history of philosophy and even in the most elaborate works on western thought he does not receive many pages. His birth in 1592 antedated Descartes' by four years and his death in 1655 was five years after that of Descartes. The fact that the two thinkers were contemporaries was unfortunate for Gassendi's reputation, for he was in competition, so to speak, with the all-conquering genius of his fellow countryman. Gassendi's fame was great, but even

in his own day it was surpassed by Descartes' and since then he has been more and more in the shadow. Yet, like Descartes, Gassendi was a representative man, and in some ways, it may be argued, he was the more typical of his time. His career holds a lesson for anyone who wishes to understand the development of modern thought and therefore of modern history.

Gassendi was a Catholic priest, a mathematician, an astronomer, and a philosopher. He lived a good life and died a holy death. He was the biographer of Copernicus and Tycho Brahe, and he was a careful astronomer himself. He was the correspondent of Galileo, Kepler, Cassini, and other scientists, and of Père Mersenne, Thomas Hobbes, and Queen Christina of Sweden. In mathematics his ability led him to be chosen as professor at the Sorbonne. In philosophy he gained an early name as an anti-Aristotelian and he also wrote against Robert Fludd, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and Descartes. But his great reputation in philosophy came as the systematic reviver of the Epicurean and atomistic doctrines. His huge *Syntagma philosophicum* presents an elaborate system of philosophy—logic, physics, metaphysics, psychology, epistemology, and ethics—that has that vastness of conception which is found so often among the works of the Renaissance as well as of the Middle Ages.

In its content, too, is the *Syntagma philosophicum* a work typical of the Renaissance. Like Descartes, Gassendi thought to cast aside his scholastic heritage, but whereas Descartes rejected the Greeks as well, Gassendi sought inspiration at the feet of Epicurus and Democritus. Yet, as in Descartes' case, Gassendi's works are filled with the thought of the great tradition with which he broke. Even when he rejected traditional doctrines and substituted something different, he thought with a mind fashioned by scholasticism and informed to no small an extent by its principles. Moreover, with him as with others, theology and philosophy could not be kept in sealed compartments. Orthodoxy in matters of faith saved him from going to an ultimate heterodoxy in matters of reason.

Gassendi's *Opera omnia* were published at Lyons in 1658 and make up six large folio volumes with a total of 4095 double-columned pages. As one looks at this vast array of print and reflects upon the immense labor that it represents, it is impossible

not to think of how futile much of it is. *Ut quid perditio haec?* Gassendi was a devout Catholic priest, a man of great natural abilities, of genuine scholarship, and, in spite of the tuberculosis that finally killed him, a man of incredible energy and industry. Yet, instead of exercising his abilities in the service of older and better doctrines, he did just the reverse. For inspiration, light, and guidance he turned not to Augustine, not to Aquinas, Bonaventure, Scotus, and Anselm, and not to Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus, but to Epicurus and Democritus.

One must lament this waste of genius. No doubt Gassendi was in part the victim of his environment, but it must not be forgotten that many others were able to rise above their intellectual surroundings and to withstand the powerful new forces. Scholasticism still flourished at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Gassendi received his education, and it had able and even great representatives then and later. The changes that Descartes made in some of his positions showed that able criticism from the scholastic camp could make itself felt. But Gassendi turned away from that camp, both to his own detriment and to that of others. If he had adhered to the *philosophia perennis*, had come to know its best spirit, and had willed to serve it, his critical powers could have been used to the advantage of both Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian thought. His scientific interests, too, would have been advanced, for he could have helped to harmonize traditional teachings and the new findings of the physical sciences.

Gassendi's actual significance is therefore twofold. He represents one phase of the modern scientific movement, particularly in his use of the atomistic hypothesis. Even more importantly, he represents part of the process of dissolution that was going on at ever-increasing speed in the seventeenth century. In that process the absolute divorce of theology and philosophy, the rejection of necessary doctrines in metaphysics, the revival of lower beliefs from pagan antiquity, and the enthronement of lesser men in the place of the great masters of medieval and Greek thought all had their place. But most of all Gassendi may be said to be a representative man and a figure of genuine influence because he is so evidently one of those Catholic thinkers who failed to see themselves for what they were, or better for what they ought to have been. Because they did not know themselves, those thinkers among whom Gassendi holds so prominent a place

could not be themselves. Therefore Gassendi and others like him failed in their great opportunity to be upbuilders as well as continuers of a genuinely Christian way of thought and action.

TWO CONTENDING POWERS

There is a passage in the work of one of the greatest of pre-Socratic philosophers which may be taken as a parable of certain aspects of human history. In the sixth century before Christ Empedocles of Akragas offered an explanation of the origin and nature of the universe in terms of "the four roots" of all things. Fire, air, earth, and water, the primitive and basic elements, are material, but they are likewise eternal and unchangeable. At first they were so intermingled as to form a perfect sphere. For such complete harmony there must have been a cause, and Empedocles named this agent love, the principle of union. Yet if there were only love and the four elements, change and movement and all the variety of particular beings could never come to be. Hence Empedocles postulated a sixth entity, strife. In his theory, as interpreted by Aristotle, both love and strife are material as well as efficient causes. As material causes they are coequals of the four roots.

Strife could indeed separate the elements from one another, but before its unimpeded power our world could not exist, any more than it could exist while love harmonized all the elements into one perfect sphere. Hence in Empedocles' story of the universe there are four periods. The first is that of the sphere. In the second period strife is entering in among the elements and love is passing out, so that the elements are partly combined and partly separated. In the third period love has been driven completely out and strife is in sole possession. Finally, in the fourth period, love has regained entrance and is strengthening its place, while strife is departing. When love has obtained complete control, then the original sphere has been reestablished and the cosmic cycle will begin again.

It is evident that a world such as ours, wherein both love and strife are at work in every part, can exist only in the second period or in the fourth. Aristotle interprets Empedocles as teaching that our world belongs to the second period, when strife increases and love grows weaker. Others have thought that our world belongs rather to the fourth period, in which the power of love is in the

ascendancy. Whichever view is correct, it must be admitted that Empedocles' cosmogony is a profound conception. The four traditional elements may be reduced to one, and even love and strife may be looked upon as a single cause. Nevertheless, as Empedocles saw, we must still postulate a material cause for the universe. Still more, as Empedocles likewise saw, we must admit that there is an efficient cause, although he mistook its character. His theory is based on an observance of nature, and although it is expressed in poetic form, it is not fanciful.

It is possible to transfer the Empedoclean idea from cosmology to ethics and to apply it, *mutatis mutandis*, to the moral order. There is something in human history corresponding to the cosmic cycle that Empedocles describes. There may never have been a golden age in which all things in and around men were so perfectly intermingled and harmonized by love that society as we know it in no wise existed. Nor will the cycle ever be completed so that the state will wither away and that fancied golden age will come again. Among men there will always be *meum* and *tuum*, and in addition to the virtue of charity the cardinal virtue of justice will remain. So also there will be a need for prudence, temperance, and fortitude, and all four cardinal virtues take cognizance of strife within us or among us. On the other hand, fierce strife will never become so deep and so general as to destroy all harmony and order. If an earthly paradise does not await us, neither does complete anarchy threaten us. "Chaos and old night" will never be the total lot of men.

Yet if all this is true, it is likewise true that there are periods in human history when that tranquillity of order which is peace, according to St. Augustine's definition, does prevail. A temporary security and a relative prosperity enable men to plan with confidence and to work with success. Sometimes it is thought that this era of good will, mutual respect, and generous co-operation will continue without break or end. Men will become wiser and better. There will be a time when "freedom slowly broadens down from precedent to precedent." Wars will cease, and all crime and strife will become but a memory of "old, unhappy, far-off things, and battles long ago." Such thoughts seized the minds of many men in the Victorian era and found expression in the doctrines of unending progress and human perfectibility. These optimistic dreams were shattered by the guns

of 1914, for all throughout that time of widespread peace strife had daily been gathering its powers.

Today it is apparent that we have reached a condition corresponding to Empedocles' second period. We live in a time of world wars and world upheavals. Never has strife been so widespread, so deep, so huge in its destructive force. Never has hatred been so intense between nations and within them, and within groups, classes, and races and between them. Never have men exploited and plundered nature in so heedless a way. Never have they waged so fierce an onslaught upon God Himself and upon their fellow men who believe in Him. So terrible has been the slaughter of human life, so wanton the destruction of goods of every order, so vast the dangers that threaten us, that shrewd intelligence as well as gross stupidity seems to have set these destructive forces in motion. We do not hesitate to say that demons as well as men are at work.

Yet in spite of the power of strife in our world, love has not been driven utterly forth and moral chaos has not yet come upon the earth. Men still love and serve one another. There is love of country and of God as well as hatred, treason, and apostasy. Among the ruins new churches, hospitals, homes, and schools arise. Amid all the slaughter the great mass of men long for peace and safety and voice their weariness of hate and strife. If all the world seems to fall apart into hostile camps, there is still comradeship within the camps, and even those who preach and practice hate must strive for harmony among themselves. There are millions of martyrs, but their lives are testaments of love and their deaths are not defeats but triumphs over hate. The Church of Christ, itself the chief object of the most unrelenting attack, stands unchanged. It teaches men, brings the means of grace to them, leads them in prayer and sacrifice, and carries on all its countless deeds of charity. The works of love are apparent on every side, and they are so many testimonies to that "Love which moves the sun and the other stars."

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE TEACHING OF THE *TESTEM BENEVOLENTIAE*

On Jan. 22, 1899, Pope Leo XIII sent an apostolic letter to Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, at that time the only American member of the Sacred College. This document, the *Testem benevolentiae*, contained one of the most important doctrinal pronouncements of modern times. It is definitely a document with which our priests should be familiar.

Some recent outstanding literary productions have aroused important new interest in the subject matter of the *Testem benevolentiae*. Exactly fifty years after the *Testem benevolentiae* was written, Fr. Felix Klein, one of the central figures in the controversy Pope Leo's letter set out to resolve, was printing the volume of his autobiography dealing with the controversy itself and with the pontifical pronouncement it provoked.[1] Two years previously Fr. Edgar Hocedez, S.J., had dealt with this topic briefly but competently in the third volume of his *Histoire de la théologie au XIX^e siècle*.[2] Last year Dr. John Tracy Ellis again focussed attention on this topic when he dealt with it in his masterly biography of Cardinal Gibbons.[3] This year Msgr. Moynihan's biography of Archbishop Ireland[4] has brought about an increased awareness of and interest in this vital pontifical document.

Unfortunately, despite the high quality of the historical and autobiographical writing that concerns the *Testem benevolentiae*, there seems to be some danger that many of our people may fall into a very regrettable misunderstanding of the teaching set forth in this letter. The misunderstanding centers around the designation "phantom heresy," which has sometimes been applied to the teachings reproved in the *Testem benevolentiae*. It would be unfortunate if our people should come to imagine that

[1] Klein, *La route du petit Morvandiau: Souvenirs de l'Abbé Félix Klein*, Tome V, *Une héresie fantome, l'américanisme* (Paris: Plon, 1949).

[2] Hocedez, *Histoire de la théologie au XIX^e siècle*, Tome III, *Le règne de Léon XIII, 1878-1903* (Brussels: L'Edition Universelle, 1947), pp. 190-94.

[3] Ellis, *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1834-1921* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1952), II, 1-80.

[4] Moynihan, *The Life of Archbishop John Ireland. A Definitive Biography* (New York: Harper and Brother, 1953), pp. 104-35.

the teachings criticized adversely in this pontifical letter were actually condemned as heretical therein. It would be much more regrettable if they were to be cajoled into imagining that the Holy See, in 1899 or at any other time, would mislead its people by attacking a non-existent doctrinal deviation.

The term "phantom heresy," applied to the teachings attacked in the *Testem benevolentiae*, certainly did not originate with Father Klein. The expression "phantom of heresy" was employed, as a matter of fact, in the Parisian newspaper *Figaro*[5] only a few months after the issuance of Pope Leo's letter to Cardinal Gibbons. Hocedez himself adverts to the use of this designation in his treatise on the history of sacred theology during the nineteenth century.[6] There can be no doubt, however, about the fact that Father Klein popularized this designation in a uniquely effective way by using it as the subtitle of what must be considered as the most interesting volume of his autobiography.[7]

The rather common use of this expression in our own day has led even as eminent and careful a scholar as Fr. Thomas McAvoy, C.S.C., to say that "in the Apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII there are several doctrines set forth and condemned as heretical by the Holy Father,"[8] and to speak of "the heresy as condemned by the Holy Father"[9] in the *Testem benevolentiae*. The use of this same terminology has tended to influence some of our people to imagine that a highly important pontifical document was concerned with errors which no one ever actually held, and which were thus not at all dangerous to the life of faith within the Catholic Church.

[5] Cf. Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 413. The expression was used in an article signed by Julien de Narfon, who spoke of "the phantom of heresy which, during these last years, disturbed the sleep of Canon Delassus and Father Maignen."

[6] Hocedez, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

[7] It must be understood that, like de Narfon, Father Klein spoke of the "phantom heresy" as existing primarily in the minds of his theological opponents. It was not applied primarily to the teaching precisely as reproved by the *Testem benevolentiae*.

[8] McAvoy, in the article "Liberalism, Americanism, Modernism," in *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, LXII, 4 (Dec., 1952), 225.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

Because there are definite and important parallels between the *Testem benevolentiae* and the present Holy Father's great encyclical letter, the *Humani generis*, it is highly important that our contemporary Catholics should realize clearly that the letter of Pope Leo XIII was not wasted on the condemnation of any "phantom heresies."

In the first place, the *Testem benevolentiae* stigmatizes neither any individual opinion of which it disapproves nor the sum total of these repudiated teachings with the note of heresy. Neither the term "heretical" nor its definition is to be found anywhere in this document. On this point alone, the designation of "phantom heresy" cannot be applied accurately to the teachings rejected in the *Testem benevolentiae*.

According to the text itself, the document deals with "certain things to be avoided and corrected (*nonnulla . . . cavenda et corrigenda*)."[10] The doctrines reproved are "new opinions"[11] and some "consequences (*consectaria*)"[12] which follow from them. These consequences are characterized as teachings of which "if the intention seem not wrong, as We believe, the things themselves will not appear by any means free from suspicion."[13] Furthermore, all the teachings dealt with in the *Testem benevolentiae*, taken together, are described as opinions which our Bishops should repudiate and condemn.[14] The Holy Father did not himself condemn these teachings as heretical. There is no indication that he expected the Bishops to do so either.

In the *Testem benevolentiae*, Pope Leo XIII declared that he was writing "on account of Our Apostolic office, in order to provide for the integrity of the faith, and to guard the security of the faithful."[15] Now the *integritas fidei* of which he spoke is something which can be injured by the holding of propositions deserving of a censure less grave than that of heresy. The Sover-

[10] I have used the English translation published in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, with a preface by John J. Wynne, S.J. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), pp. 441-53, and the Latin text as published in the *Codicis iuris canonici fontes*, edited by Pietro Cardinal Gasparri (Vatican Press, 1933), III, 535-42. The present citation is to be found in *Wynne*, p. 441, and in *CICF*, 535.

[11] *Wynne*, p. 442; *CICF*, *loc. cit.*

[12] *Wynne*, p. 445; *CICF*, 537.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Cf. *Wynne*, p. 452; *CICF*, 541.

[15] *Wynne*, p. 441; *CICF*, 535.

eign Pontiff wished to protect that integrity and to safeguard the people Our Lord had entrusted to him by the process of reproving certain definite propositions.

The principle or foundation upon which the opinions censured in the *Testem benevolentiae* rested was, according to Pope Leo XIII, the statement that "in order the more easily to bring over to Catholic doctrine those who dissent from it, the Church ought to adapt herself somewhat to our advanced civilization, and, relaxing her ancient rigor, show some indulgence to modern theories and methods (*recens invectis populorum placitis ac rationibus indulgere*)."[16] The Pope wrote that there were "many" who hold (*arbitrantur*) that this principle should be applied, not only to the rule of life, but also to the deposit of faith.[17] "For they contend," said Pope Leo, "that it is opportune, in order to work in a more attractive way upon the wills of those who are not in accord with us, to pass over certain points of doctrine, as if of lesser moment, or so to soften them that they may not have the same meaning which the Church has invariably held."[18]

The *Testem benevolentiae* teaches that this general principle as applied to the deposit of faith can be disproved by an appeal to the Church's teaching on the nature and the origin of Catholic doctrine, as set forth in the Vatican Council's constitution *Dei Filius*.[19] And, dismissing the opinion that some of the points of Catholic doctrine may be passed over in bringing the Church's message to those outside the fold, it reminds us that *all* the truths of Christian doctrine come to us from Our Lord, and that all of them are adapted to every age and to every nationality. This section of the document ends with one of the most eloquent passages in modern pontifical literature.

> Far be it, then, for any one to diminish or for any reason whatever to pass over any of this divinely revealed doctrine; whosoever would do so, would rather wish to alienate Catholics from the Church than to bring over to the Church those who dissent from it. Let them return; indeed, nothing is nearer to Our heart; let all those who are wandering far from the sheepfold of Christ return; but let it not be by any other road than that which Christ has pointed out.[20]

---

[16] *Wynne*, p. 442; *CICF*, 535.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Ibid.*
[19] The passage is found in *DB*, 1800.
[20] *Wynne*, p. 443; *CICF*, 536.

It is interesting to note that a very similar task was accomplished by Pope Pius XII in the writing of his encyclical, the *Humani generis*. The present Holy Father speaks of those who aim "at adapting ecclesiastical teaching and methods to modern conditions and requirements." He states that this can be done correctly, "through the introduction of some new explanations," but also warns that "some, through enthusiasm for an imprudent eirenism, seem to consider as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union things founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on institutions founded by Him, or which are the defense and support of the integrity of the faith, and the removal of which would bring about the union of all, but only to their own destruction."[21]

Clearly, then, the fundamental doctrinal fault reproved in the *Testem benevolentiae* is intimately related to one of the basic errors condemned in the *Humani generis*. The men Pope Leo set out to correct believed that, even in doctrines in which the deposit of faith is contained, the Church ought to adapt itself to contemporary theory and practice. They likewise held it expedient and legitimate, in their statements of the Catholic message, to pass over points of doctrine to which their non-Catholic contemporaries were presumed to be unsympathetic. Pope Pius, on the other hand, spoke of men who thought that Catholic theology and the traditional theological methods should be completely reformed "in order to promote the more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion."[22] In both cases the Vicar of Christ was faced with a situation in which some of his children believed that certain statements contained in the body of Catholic doctrine would repel those outside the Church and that therefore these teachings should be changed or eliminated. Pope Leo wrote to protect the integrity of the Faith, and Pope Pius blamed the innovators of our day for their opposition to truths in which the defense and the support of the integrity of the Faith is to be found.

Pope Leo taught that people must be brought to Our Lord

[21] The NCWC translation, p. 6. The Latin text is found in *AER*, CXXIII, 5 (Nov. 1951), 386.

[22] *Ibid.*

only by the way that He had indicated. Pope Pius warned that attempts to procure religious unity at the expense of truths pertaining to the body of Catholic doctrine could only result in a unity that would be ruinous to those who found it.

After considering the principle according to which the Church should modify its position in the face of contemporary cultural conditions, and after discussing the application of that principle to truths contained in the deposit of divine faith, the *Testem benevolentiae* goes on to deal with the application of this same principle to the field of law, Church discipline, or the rule of life. It reminds its readers that those who presume to usurp the right of the Church to modify its laws or who hold that the existing discipline of the Church is useless or too rigid to be obeyed are holding a doctrine that is "injurious to the Church and to the Spirit of God which governs her."[23] Pope Leo wrote that such individuals are in danger of incurring the censure which Pius VI inflicted upon the 78th proposition of the Synod of Pistoia.[24] It is interesting, incidentally, to note that of the seven censures given to this proposition, all were below the grade of heresy.[25]

The *Testem benevolentiae* then goes on to explain that this late nineteenth-century movement for a change in Catholic discipline is in some measure worse than that manifested by the *Pistorienses*. The men whose teaching Pope Leo set out to correct held, as *rerum novarum sectatores*, "that a certain liberty ought to be introduced into the Church, so that, limiting the exercise and vigilance of its powers, each one of the faithful may act more freely in pursuance of his own natural bent and capacity." Pope Leo noted that they claimed that "this is called for in order to imitate that liberty which, though quite recently introduced, is now the law and the foundation of almost every civil community."[26]

The *Testem benevolentiae* simply refers to the *Immortale Dei* for a discussion of the civil liberties to which the *rerum novarum*

[23] *Wynne*, p. 444; *CICF*, 537.

[24] Cf. *DB*, 1578.

[25] The proposition was qualified as "falsa, temeraria, scandalosa, perniciosa, piarum aurium offensiva, Ecclesiae ac Spiritui Dei, quo ipsa regitur, iniuriosa, ad minus erronea."

[26] *Wynne*, p. 444; *CICF*, 537.

sectatores appealed.[27] It took cognizance, however, of another argument which had been alleged in favor of the proposition which it had already condemned. According to that process of reasoning, there is, since the Vatican Council's definition of papal infallibility, no more need for many of the previous restrictions which had been imposed upon Catholics and that thus "a wider field of thought and action is thrown open to individuals."[28] Pope Leo repudiated this sort of reasoning, and showed that the problems of the time called for the exercise of that pontifical authority of which the Vatican Council had spoken so effectively.[29]

All of the above material had been concerned with the basic opinions of the innovators. The rest of the letter deals with the *consectaria* or consequences of these teachings. The first of these was a certain abuse of devotion to the Holy Ghost, according to which all external guidance or direction was depicted as disadvantageous for those who desire to devote themselves to the acquisition of Christian perfection. According to the men who erred along this line, the Holy Ghost "pours greater and richer gifts into the hearts of the faithful now than in times past; and by a certain instinct teaches and moves them with no one as an intermediary."[30]

Pope Leo first dealt with the assertion that the graces of the Holy Ghost were more plentiful in his time than at any previous period by asking who would dare to say that the primitive Church of the Apostles and the martyrs, and the Church of the past ages with its saints, had a lesser outpouring of the graces of the Holy Ghost than the Church of his own time. He briefly summarized the Catholic teaching on the place of the Holy Ghost and the function of human direction in the spiritual life. He then asserted that those who rejected this doctrine did so rashly and at their own peril (*temere profecto ac periculose*).[31]

He then dealt with the error of those who exalted the natural virtues above the supernatural virtues. He explained why that position was incorrect, and stated that it was difficult to understand how a man imbued with Christian principles could come

[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Wynne*, p. 445; *CICF*, 537.
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] *Wynne*, p. 446; *CICF*, 538.
[31] *Wynne*, p. 447; *CICF*, 538.

to hold it.[32] He then adverted to an error according to which some men classified some virtues as active and others as passive, claiming that, as the latter had been better suited to former times, the former were more in keeping with the present. He noted that these so-called passive virtues were genuine evangelical virtues, and taught that "there is not and cannot be a virtue which is really passive."[33]

Against those who disapproved of religious orders or congregations taking vows, the Holy Father spoke out in forthright fashion. He noted that there were other kinds of communities fostered and encouraged in the Church, but insisted upon the preeminence of those "who have left all things and have followed Christ."[34]

Finally, the *Testem benevolentiae* takes up the position of those who held "that the way and the method which Catholics have followed thus far for recalling those who differ with us is to be abandoned and another resorted to."[35] It indicates the imprudence of giving up methods which the Church has always employed. It teaches about the obligation of the faithful and of the priests to engage, in their own ways, in this missionary work. And it commends and cautions those who employ new techniques in the work of conversion.

We can sum up, accurately, even though inadequately, the opinions reproved by the *Testem benevolentiae*, under the following headings.

(1) The Church should adapt itself to contemporary civilization even with respect to doctrines in which the deposit of faith is contained.

(2) In bringing Catholic teaching to non-Catholics, it is opportune to pass over certain statements contained in it.

(3) The Church should adapt itself to contemporary civilization in the matter of its discipline.

(4) A new liberty ought to be introduced into the Church.

(5) The Vatican Council's definition of papal infallibility has thrown a wider field of thought and action open to individual Catholics.

[32] *Wynne*, p. 447; *CICF*, 539.
[33] *Wynne*, p. 448; *CICF*, 539.
[34] *Wynne*, p. 451; *CICF*, 541.
[35] *Ibid.*

(6) In the spiritual life, external guidance is to be rejected as superfluous.

(7) The Holy Ghost gives richer graces now than in times past.

(8) The natural virtues are to be preferred to the supernatural.

(9) The active virtues are to be preferred to the passive.

(10) Religious vows and the religious life are no longer advantageous to the Church.

(11) Old methods for bringing the faith to non-Catholics are to be abandoned and replaced.

The last six of these teachings are represented by Pope Leo as consequences or *consectaria* of the first five. The first five, in the context of the document, are applications of one general or fundamental principle.

The first and second of these repudiated teachings are undoubtedly the most important. Yet they were definitely not condemned in the *Testem benevolentiae* (or, for that matter, in the *Humani generis*), as heresies. They were rejected, however, as errors that would effectively militate against that integrity of the Catholic Faith which it is the duty and the prerogative of the Roman Pontiff to defend.

The third proposition is not condemned outright at all. It is presented as erroneous only when it is understood as granting to individuals, rather than to the authority of the Church itself, the right to modify the discipline imposed upon Our Lord's faithful.

The fourth proposition, as it is fully explained in the text of the *Testem benevolentiae*, is reprehensible, and is duly reprehended. It is said to be worse than the offending and similar teaching of the Synod of Pistoia which was stigmatized by Pius VI as *ad minus erronea*. Yet it must be understood that there is no direct or indirect assertion in the *Testem benevolentiae* that this fourth proposition is heretical.

The fifth proposition had little doctrinal importance. It was mentioned and reproved merely because it was one of the reasons alleged in favor of the previous assertion. Obviously neither this nor any of the *consectaria* are designated as heretical by Pope Leo in the document with which we are concerned.

The *Testem benevolentiae* dealt, then, with inaccurate propositions, but was definitely not a document that condemned heresies.

The errors with which it was concerned, however, were far from being "phantoms."

It attributed the first two propositions we have listed to "many" people. Fifty-one years later, the present Holy Father felt himself obliged, in carrying out his supreme doctrinal work within the Church, to condemn much the same errors.

Like the *Humani generis* half a century later, the *Testem benevolentiae* carefully avoided attributing the errors it condemned to any individual or to any group. Pope Leo said that he was writing, out of Christian charity, to put an end to certain contentions which had then recently arisen among us, in our country.[36] He likewise adverted to the controversies which had developed around the book to which Father Klein had contributed a preface.[37] He did not accuse either the defenders of the book or its opponents of doctrinal inaccuracy. Neither did he blame any group or faction on this side of the ocean. He was engaged in teaching the truth and in putting down error. He did not want to expose or to hurt those who had taught incorrectly.

To assert, however, that what he condemned in the *Testem benevolentiae* was some phantom error would be seriously to abuse the kindness of a great Pontiff. It would likewise constitute a rather dangerous misinterpretation of a highly important papal document and would serve as a completely undesirable precedent.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[36] *Wynne*, p. 441; *CICF*, 535.
[37] *Ibid.*

Answers to Questions

THE GARB FOR THE MINISTER OF PENANCE

Question 1: Is a priest forbidden to hear confessions while dressed in his street clothes, but wearing a stole?

Question 2: What sin would a priest commit if he heard confessions in his street clothes without a stole?

Question 3: What sin would be committed if the priest heard confessions in sport clothes?

Answer 1: The Ritual prescribes that the minister of Penance shall wear a surplice and stole, "as far as the time or the custom of the place demands." It is presupposed that the priest is wearing a cassock or religious habit. As the Ritual itself implies, custom may render unnecessary the surplice or the stole or both. In our country, custom requires the stole, except in the case of certain religious, who have a custom to the contrary. Similarly, custom allows the administration of Penance by a priest dressed in his clerical street clothes and a stole, when there is even a slight reason for not wearing the cassock, as when he is visiting the sick, or is about to leave the house when some one comes for confession. It should be noted that even those religious who are excused from wearing a stole by virtue of a custom should don a stole to hear a confession when they are dressed in street clothes.

Answer 2: To hear a confession in one's street garb without a stole would be a venial sin. For a good reason, however, a priest would be allowed to administer the sacrament in this way—for example, if a sick person requested confession and the priest had no stole with him. Needless to say the priest could act thus for the benefit of one in danger of death.

Answer 3: It would be wrong to hear a confession in sport clothes, unless there was a very good reason to function in this garb, even though the priest donned a stole. However, apart from scandal, it would not be a grave sin.

PRACTICE FOR FIRST COMMUNION

Question: In order to familiarize a child with the proper way to receive his First Communion, would a priest be allowed to give him an unconsecrated host, explaining that it is only bread, and that he is merely practicing the manner in which he is to receive Our Lord under the appearances of bread on the day of his First Communion?

Answer: Theoretically there would be no objection to this procedure, as long as the child is fully aware that the host he is receiving in practice is only bread, not the body of Our Lord. But I would not recommend the method, since I believe that some children would not sufficiently grasp the difference between the unconsecrated particle and the Blessed Sacrament, and might conclude either that they are now receiving the body and blood of Christ or that on the day of their First Communion they will receive only bread.

THE OFFICE WORKER AND THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

Question: A girl working in a city office must leave her home for work at 8:15 in the morning. She wishes to receive Holy Communion daily. There is a 7 o'clock Mass in her parish church. She could attend this Mass, return home for her breakfast and leave the house on time, but this would be very inconvenient, especially since it would make it necessary for her to rise at 6 o'clock. However, it is possible for her to attend a noonday Mass in the city, during her lunch hour. Would she be allowed, in virtue of the new eucharistic fast privileges, to take some substantial liquid nourishment in the morning and receive Holy Communion at the noonday Mass? She would thus be enabled to have an extra (well-needed) hour of sleep in the morning, and yet be allowed to satisfy her desire for daily Communion.

Answer: I believe that an office worker in the circumstances described by the questioner could receive Holy Communion at the noonday Mass, after taking some liquid nourishment, on the grounds that she can attend only a late Mass. For, although absolutely speaking, she could partake of the Holy Eucharist at

the early Mass in her parish church, the inconvenience which it would involve, especially the loss of an hour's sleep for one who is doubtless a faithful worker, would justify the statement that it is morally impossible for her to receive Holy Communion except at the noonday Mass. Of course, she should consult a confessor on the matter, as the Constitution *Christus Dominus* prescribed, but it is my opinion that a confessor in these circumstances could unhesitatingly declare the girl free to make use of the privilege which Pope Pius XII graciously granted to those who can receive Holy Communion only at a late hour.

THE RIGHT TO BAPTIZE A CONVERT

Question: I am conducting regular classes for non-Catholics who wish to learn about the teachings of the Catholic Church. After attending the course some of these express the desire to receive Baptism and enter the Church. Occasionally one of these applicants resides outside the boundaries of my parish. May I baptize such a convert, or am I obliged to send him to the pastor of his residence?

Answer: Dr. Bernard Kelly makes the following statement on this problem:

In many parts of this country there exists a custom whereby converts are baptized by the priest who supervised their instruction rather than by their proper pastor. In most cases, it is true, the baptism is administered conditionally and perhaps privately as well, inasmuch as the local ordinary is empowered to permit the use of the private form in the case of heretics who as adults are baptized conditionally (Can. 759, §2). Such a baptism would not constitute a reserved parochial function. But when it is a question of solemn baptism, this practice is contrary to the prescript of the common law, and can hardly be justified unless the local ordinary, by virtue of the power which he derives from Canon 738, §1, has expressly decreed that the priest who supervised the instruction may also perform the baptism.

In fact, there are several reasons why this practice should be permitted and even legalized. Granted that the pastor is the lawful minister, it must also be recognized that the priest who instructs the convert has some interest in perfecting the work which he has begun. Moreover, the convert's entrance into the Church is rendered unnecessarily

stiff and embarrassing when he is compelled to request his baptism at the hands of one who, though technically his proper pastor, may nevertheless be a strange and awesome personage in the eyes of the catechumen. It is the opinion of the writer that such a statute would be desirable, and would moreover serve to clarify the existing confusion in the baptism of converts. Precautions should be taken, however, that the record of baptism be transmitted to the proper pastor for insertion in the parish register (Rev. Bernard M. Kelly, *The Functions Reserved to Pastors* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947], pp. 67-68).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

BENEDICTION ON FEAST OF SACRED HEART

Question: I was attending Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on the feast of the Sacred Heart which fell on June 12, the day following the octave day of Corpus Christi. The celebrant sang the *Panem de caelo* and added the Alleluia. I thought the Alleluia verse was added only during the Paschal season and during the octave of Corpus Christi.

Answer: The instructions set forth in the Ordo as well as those given by authors specifically state that whenever the verse *Panem de caelo* is read or sung during the octave of Corpus Christi the Alleluia is added. This ceases when the octave ends and the Alleluia is not continued on the following day, even though it is the feast of the Sacred Heart.

READING THE LAST GOSPEL

Question: Is it permissible for the priest to take up into his hands the altar card to read the gospel of St. John at the end of the Mass?

Answer: Rubricians never mention this practice in setting forth the various directions given about the ceremonies of Holy Mass. We might excuse it for a priest with very bad eyes but see no justification for such practice otherwise.

PURIFYING THE CHALICE

Question: When a priest is lawfully saying Mass without a server how precisely does he purify the chalice?

Answer: The celebrant of the Mass uses his right hand to pour both wine and water into the chalice over the fingers (thumb and index finger) of the left hand. Then having set aside the water cruet, he places the thumb and index finger of the right hand into the chalice ablution. From there he continues in the normal way.

BLESSED SACRAMENT CHAPEL

Question: In a chapel where there is perpetual adoration, would the oration of the Blessed Sacrament be numbered with those ordered by the rubrics in determining whether or not to omit the *oratio imperata?*

Answer: The oration in honor of the Blessed Sacrament must be said at the Mass immediately preceding the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for any public cause. Likewise, we are told that it must be recited at all Masses in a church where there is exposition for some length of time for any public cause. It follows those prescribed by the rubrics and precedes the *oratio imperata.*

ALTAR BELL

Question: Recently a visiting priest corrected my altar boy for ringing the bell when he removed the veil from the chalice prior to the offertory prayers. Kindly inform me if I have been training the boys incorrectly.

Answer: The directions given for altar boys tell us that the bell should be rung at the Sanctus and at the Elevation. The Congregation of Sacred Rites (No. 4377) in a decision permits the bell to be rung at the *Hanc igitur* when the priest spreads his hands over the chalice. Dom Britt says that it is an approved custom to ring the bell at the *Domine non sum dignus* in Mass but it should not be rung when the priest says these words before the distribution of Holy Communion. None of the rubricians make

mention of ringing the bell at the Offertory, although we are aware that this custom prevails quite generally.

BENEDICTION WITH THE CIBORIUM

Question: Is permission of the Ordinary required to have Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament with the ciborium? How many candles must burn at this ceremony?

Answer: The Code of Canon Law (Can. 1274) states that private exposition with the ciborium can take place any day and without special permission of the Ordinary.

For private Benediction at least six candles should be lighted at the altar. The celebrant at private Benediction does not expose the ciborium on the altar but he may bring it forward in the tabernacle so that it may be seen by the people.

WEARING THE BIRETTA

Question: Please give some general direction for wearing the biretta. It is difficult to know when and when not to wear it for ceremonies as one observes his fellow priests and their customs.

Answer: The biretta is worn by the celebrant of any service when he proceeds to the altar from the sacristy and again when returning to the sacristy, except in the instance when the Blessed Sacrament is exposed.

VENI CREATOR AT CONFIRMATION SERVICE

Question: Recently we had Confirmation at our parish and some of the clergy said it was wrong that we did not have the *Veni Creator* sung during the Confirmation service. I have looked up a few authors and am more confused than ever. Please enlighten me on this problem.

Answer: The Pontifical containing the official ceremonies and instructions for Bishops does not prescribe the *Veni Creator* at any time during the administration of the Sacrament of Confir-

mation. Stehle in his *Manual of Episcopal Ceremonies*, describing the entrance of the Bishop to the church, says: "The procession moves on to the sanctuary. Before the altar all make the proper reverence and kneel. The Veni Creator *may* be sung or recited." Wapelhorst remarks "hymnus, 'Veni Creator,' cum oratione, 'Deus qui corda, etc.,' laudabiliter cantatur" after the Bishop reaches the altar. Immediately he refers to a footnote taken from Milholland's *Ceremonial* wherein it is stated "on arriving at the altar, the Bishop kneels, and although it is not prescribed by the Pontifical, the hymn, Veni Creator Spiritus, and the prayers, Deus qui corda fidelium, may be sung."

Martinucci, Moretti, Fortescue, and Ahearn make no mention of the *Veni Creator* sung or recited at any time during the Confirmation ceremony. One certainly could not object to following the instructions set forth by Stehle, Wapelhorst or Milholland.

INSIDE TABERNACLE VEIL

Question: Is it necessary or required by law that there be a veil on the inside of the tabernacle?

Answer: The Congregation of Sacred Rites has issued decisions on various occasions stating that the veil on the inside of the tabernacle is not necessary. We are warned, however, that the presence of this veil does not fulfill the requirement nor is it a substitute for the exterior tabernacle veil or *conopaeum*. In some tabernacles the inside veil is a great inconvenience and nuisance.

APOLOGIES

Recently an inquirer asked about the custom of removing the maniple or both maniple and chasuble when he is about to preach at Sunday Mass. Wapelhorst in a footnote justifies such a custom with the following statement, "Concionator deponat casulam et manipulum ad scamnum, si ipse ascendat ad pulpitum; secus, manipulum tantum in Altari." At the time of inquiry we were unable to find a rubrician to justify this custom of some priests.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME, AND OTHER PRAYERS AND POEMS. By Francis Cardinal Spellman. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. Pp. 111. $2.50.

A strong patriotism, motivated by the love of God and enlightened by faith, is the force which has inspired these poems and prayers of the Cardinal Archbishop of New York. For the Cardinal, true patriotism involves not merely a man's affection for his own nation, for its cities and its countryside, but a vital concern for the spiritual well-being of its people.

The loyalty to the Americans who are doing the most and suffering the most for their homeland has twice brought the Cardinal to visit and to live with our American soldiers in Korea. He has expressed that loyalty to his people, his affection for Our Lady, and his love for Our Lord in this little volume.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

THE CANA MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. By Dr. A. H. Clemens. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. Pp. 54. 75 cents.

The old saying, "Everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it," applies also to marriage. Everybody talks about marriage. Not many people know much about it, as the divorce record indicates.

The Cana Conference Movement is a group that is doing something about marriage. This group knows something about it and is trying earnestly to learn more about it. The object is happier, holier, and more effective marriages.

To the hundreds of priests and thousands of married couples interested in gauging the growth of the Church's newest child in the Family Life Movement, this small brochure offers an accurate and ready reference. Its importance lies in the fact that it is the initial attempt to survey the Cana Movement in its phenomenal growth since the beginning ten years ago. From the uninitiated to the veteran Cana conductor the excellent graphs contribute valuable insight to the content of Cana, the multi-organizational techniques, and varied promotional procedures employed in many areas of the country.

Names of Dioceses promoting the Cana Movement, official lists of Diocesan Cana directors and Cana conductors, and a valuable bibliography complete this excellent survey.

JOSEPH F. RYDER

RECENT THOUGHT IN FOCUS. By Donald Nicholl. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1953. Pp. 250. $3.50.

This book is an attempt to evaluate modern thought in various areas, under the headings of philosophy, natural sciences, and psychology. The philosophies discussed are those of Marxism, phenomenology, existentialism, and logical positivism. Evolution, and especially the evolution of man, are examined under the question of the natural sciences. Under the heading of psychology, the author examines particularly Freud, Adler, and Jung.

Among the philosophies, Marxism is well known, and so needs no introduction. Phenomenology is largely a method of exact description of experience. In many followers of the school, this method is joined with an idealistic tendency to assert that there is no reality other than experience, or that at least we do not know of any such reality. Existentialism is a very diversified movement, whose leaders have little in common beyond a great interest in man and his destiny, which they consider the proper object of philosophy rather than "being." "Existence" for these philosophers is the peculiar kind of being that man has, and they try to consider it in itself, in its relation to the world and to other men, and in its relation to transcendence—the existence of God is asserted or denied, depending on the particular kind of existentialism proposed, but in either case it is a very important point. Logical positivism is basically a very elaborate logic, whose key idea is that all statements which have meaning must in some way or other be reduced to statements about sensible reality.

The doctrines of Freud likewise need little introduction, since they have been broadcast for many years. Adler, whose original point of departure was similar to that of Freud, differs most noticeably from the latter in that he seeks the key to the understanding of man in the "will to power" rather than in the sex instinct. Jung is the founder of a third school of psychology; his leading ideas are those of a collective soul for mankind and the notion of symbolic experiences.

The author of this book realizes that he has taken on a large task in expounding these and other ideas in such a short compass (cf. p. 31). It is doubtful that he realizes the seriousness of the problem—the digest mentality is unfortunately widespread. But one should be cau-

tious about recommending this book to anyone who knows any of the subjects mentioned in it—they will not only be astounded at its jaunty condensations, they are likely to lose all respect for the intellectual side of the Catholic position.

In particular, there are some mistakes and some peculiar arguments. The author glibly disposes of the positions taken by some scientists by asserting that a "scientific fact" is a "statement that . . ." (pp. 40-43). He holds that we do not infer God's existence, but that we know it immediately (p. 100). He asserts that emotions have no object (p. 102). He interprets "form," apparently including the "substantial form," as a pattern of organization (p. 163), which would certainly make it impossible to say that the human soul is the substantial form of the body. He says that St. Thomas begins his *Summa theologiae* with an account of being in general (p. 101). At greater length, he approves, though with some qualifications, of Jungian psychology, apparently on the ground that Jung thinks religion is a fine thing; the author does not seem to realize that for Jung religion need have nothing to do with God. He adopts the Jungian notion of symbol, and becomes quite enthusiastic over symbolic experiences (pp. 214-16), apparently lacking an understanding of what Thomistic philosophers mean by the analogy of being.

This last point is related to a basic question about the validity of the procedure adopted in this book. The author is understandably resentful of the arrogance of self-constituted experts, and he maintains (a) that there is a kind of knowledge which is obtainable by everyone and is basic to all knowledge, and (b) that consequently the expert must be judged by common sense.

Those who agree with the author that "philosophers, for the average man, are an object of fun. It is well that they should remain so on the whole . . ." will not agree with the rest of this review. For the position of this reviewer can be expressed thus. Many Catholics do not need to be philosophers, nor to know any philosophy. With their faith guiding their natural knowledge, they know all they need to know and can find salvation. They can safely ignore science, philosophy, mathematics, and so forth. Many other persons find their natural drive for knowledge well satisfied in the purified and broadened kind of knowledge that they find in the humanities, especially literature and history. But there are also some persons, many of whom are not yet actual members of the Church, who need to develop themselves along the lines of organized and systematic knowledge. The sciences, philosophy, and theology are intellectual habits on this level of knowledge. These intellectual habits involve a systematic training and a carefully controlled reasoning. To substitute "common sense" for these